

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF...

ARMED WARFARE!



by WILLIAM PAUL

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF...

ARMED WARFARE!



by WILLIAM PAUL

Standard Book Number 911348-03-3-paper edition
Standard Book Number 911348-04-1-cloth edition

Printed in the United States of America
Copyright © 1969 by Scripture Supply House
Post Office Box 16337
Portland, Ore. 97216

DEDICATION

To Warren E. Bell,
from whose teachings I came to
“learn war no more.”

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	PAGE	1
PART I		
<u>"New Testament Teaching on Christians Participating in War"</u>		
CHAPTER 1	Viewing War from a Christian Standpoint	PAGE 5
CHAPTER 2	A Christian and His Enemies	PAGE 8
CHAPTER 3	A Christian and Evildoers	PAGE 12
CHAPTER 4	A Christian and His Neighbors	PAGE 15
CHAPTER 5	A Christian and His Brethren	PAGE 18
CHAPTER 6	Participation in War and the "Golden Rule"	PAGE 21
CHAPTER 7	Participation in War and the "Great Commission"	PAGE 23
CHAPTER 8	Participation in War and Prayer	PAGE 26
CHAPTER 9	The Peaceful Nature of the Kingdom of God	PAGE 29
CHAPTER 10	The Fruit of the Spirit Versus the Fruit of War	PAGE 35
CHAPTER 11	Jesus Prophecies Neutrality for Christians	PAGE 41
CHAPTER 12	The Attitude of Early Christians Toward War	PAGE 47
PART II		
<u>"Common Objections to Christians Not Participating in War"</u>		
CHAPTER 1	"What If Everyone Felt that Way About It?"	PAGE 62
CHAPTER 2	"Aren't Christians Supposed to Give Their Lives for One Another?"	PAGE 66
CHAPTER 3	"It Would Be a Stumbling Block Not to Fight for Our Country in War"	PAGE 68
CHAPTER 4	"Didn't Jesus Use Violence in Driving the Moneychangers Out of the Temple?"	PAGE 70
CHAPTER 5	"Wasn't Cornelius the Centurion a Soldier?"	PAGE 74
CHAPTER 6	"Doesn't Being in Subjection to the Higher Powers Require Going to War?"	PAGE 78
CHAPTER 7	"Doesn't Paying Taxes Assist in Carrying On War?"	PAGE 84
CHAPTER 8	"But Killing in War is Done as an Agent of the Government and Not as a Personal Act"	PAGE 87
CHAPTER 9	"But Didn't God's People in the Old Testament Go to War?"	PAGE 91
CHAPTER 10	"What Would You Do if your Wife, Mother or Daughter were Attacked or Molested?"	PAGE 96
EPILOGUE		PAGE 102
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY		PAGE 105
SCRIPTURE INDEX		PAGE 107

Foreword

I feel highly honored to be asked to write a Foreword for such a fine work on the Christian and war as has been compiled so carefully by brother William E. Paul. He has, to my mind, done the most exacting and clear presentation of the Christian's attitude toward war that has yet been compiled in our generation.

Every young Christian will be called upon to make the decision as to whether he will go to war or not. Every means known to man will be used to induce him to take arms, from the preacher (often times) to the "ladies" on the draft board; therefore he must KNOW why he believes and have a basis to stand on. This book is the best source of material to substantiate the Christian's refusal to go to war and kill that I have found anywhere.

When the Lord spoke and inspired His writers of the New Testament, keep in mind, He knew the hearts of men and he knew the history of men and nations, with war after war causing nation after nation to fall and another to be built on its blood and ashes. He knew the appeals that would be made to His followers to fight for national pride, and the strength of the press, radio, TV and all kinds of mass media to stir the hearts of men to go and fight.

Any man who has lived through a war knows the power of mass hysteria and when that time comes the Christian must have convictions as deep as the Word of God, and as sound as the God who gave it. This book will help to crystalize Christian convictions on the war issues, no matter what nation makes the appeal. Every Christian should be willing to sacrifice his life for the cause of Christ and for his fellowmen, but he is not willing to kill anybody.

Martyrs of the first centuries gladly gave their lives as a witness, but they did not try to kill those who were putting them to death, even though they were godly idolaters. We are their children and the source of our convictions is the same, **THE WORD OF GOD.**

May this book be used to strengthen Christian faith.

A. Word

Introduction

Seldom in the course of human history has the beating of war drums been completely silent. As far back as the records go we can read of conflict between mankind. It seems that each generation is either trying to forget the horrors of the last war or else viewing with dread the coming of the next one. Because of this it makes the Christian's relationship to war always a timely topic for sober consideration.

In setting forth the proposition of this book, we intend to meet the issue head-on. In doing so we realize that it may not meet with popular approval. To question whether a person should be a member of the armed forces during peacetime may be considered by some to be foolishly impractical. To question it during wartime is usually looked upon as unpatriotic, if not downright cowardly. Be that as it may, the fear of popular opinion must not influence our conclusion in a matter where the will of God is at stake.

There are several schools of thought which voice opposition to participating in war. The Humanist objects to war on the ethical ground that human beings should not try to settle their differences by killing one another. He reasons that the welfare of humanity is sufficient cause for refraining from war "because he sees the innate value in the human being."¹ While there is merit in this point of view, we will not approach the subject of war from that angle in this work.

Then there are others, of the "liberal" or "modernistic" school of religious thought who strongly object to engaging in carnal warfare. Harry Emerson Fosdick stated it well in a sermon delivered in New York City in 1933 when he said, "I renounce war because of what it does to our own men...because of what it compels us to do to our

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

enemies...for the lies it lives on and propagates, for the underlying hatreds it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it."²

Who would question the worthiness of these motives for renouncing participation in war? But, unfortunately, the "modernist" who holds these views concerning war also holds other views which reject such Biblical teaching as "the virgin birth of Christ", "the bodily resurrection of Christ" and the miracles of our Lord. Because of this, the person who opposes going to war is frequently classed a "modernist" in his view of the Scriptures. This should not be done without first making a careful investigation into one's entire outlook toward the Bible.

The presentation given in this book should not be misunderstood. It is not to be considered the "pacifist" viewpoint of modern religious liberalism. Our attitude toward the Bible is one of unqualified acceptance of it as the divinely inspired Word of God. It is from this conviction that we approach our study of a Christian's attitude toward war.

A third voice is being heard these days crying out against war. It is the voice of the confirmed Marxist. He would have us think that Communism is strongly opposed to war. Lenin promised "peace and land" to the peasants of Russia in order to gain their confidence and then led an armed revolt resulting in his seizing of power.³ Communist "peace" talk is merely a clever smoke screen behind which it hides while planning whatever vicious war action it feels necessary to gain its desired ends. Bible Christianity and atheistic Communism are at opposite poles. Let no one make the mistake of thinking for a moment that the position set forth herein has anything in common with the hypocritical Communist double talk about its lying love for "peace."

The purpose for this book is twofold. First of all, material dealing with a Christian's relationship to war is not abundantly available. A number of large publishing houses write that they have nothing on the subject in their stock of books. Several excellent books and pamphlets have been produced on war, but due to waning interest they are seldom reprinted after the initial supply is sold out. The present work, then, is an attempt to fill this need. The material will be in a rather condensed

form and will feature an index of all Scriptures used plus a select bibliography, items not usually found in briefer works such as this.

The second reason has to do with the rising tide of world Communism. Christians are becoming alarmed at the rapid advance of this extremely militant form of atheism. People are asking what can be done to halt the onslaught of this evil menace. Impending world crisis seems imminent. Nuclear war clouds hover above and political fervor is at a high pitch. The desire to "do something" about Communism has brought with it the temptation for Christians to feel they must "fight fire with fire." From a legitimate concern to stem this godless scourge from overrunning the world, some well-meaning people are being led to advocate the use of armed warfare. Among those who formerly took a strong stand against killing as an agent of the government, there are some who now are ready to take up arms, as guerillas, for a fight to the finish with Communism. Rodney Reyman quotes a young preacher who stated this very attitude bluntly by saying, "The only way to deal with the Communists is blood and guts."⁴

A well-known preacher, who has written some of the best material against Christians participating in war, has now reversed his position. His change of view appears to coincide with his intensive study and prolific writing on the nature of Communism. There are indications that this trend may be gaining ground among others also.

It seems that when a crisis brings nations to the brink of war, people are more easily aroused to take up weapons and fight. This can even be true with Christians.

Before the Civil War, James A. Garfield, then a preacher among churches of Christ in Ohio, opposed the idea of Christians participating in war. But when this nation erupted into a bitter struggle over the slavery issue, Garfield (later to become our twentieth president) apparently changed his conviction, for he entered the Northern army and rose to the rank of General as a result of his gallant action in battle.⁵

Certainly Communism is a terrible evil. This is because it is so diametrically opposed to the religion of Jesus Christ. But in the process of combating its atheistic influence, our every attitude and action must be governed, not by mere emotion, but by the decrees of God's Word.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

It is not our intention to propose solutions to the world's problems, nor to suggest the course of action which national leaders should take to reduce international tensions. It is not our intention to set forth the popular "pacifist" viewpoint which hopes to see the total abolishment of war from the face of the earth. This is no more possible than to rid the world of robbery, murder or sex crimes. The Epistle of James, the fourth chapter, indicates that war will continue as long as men lust and covet.

Instead, our purpose is to present plain teaching from the New Testament concerning a Christian's relationship to carnal warfare. It is our hope that this study will prove helpful to God's children in aiding them to form convictions in harmony with the will of Almighty God.

The Author

NOTES FROM THE INTRODUCTION

1. Philip Altbach, THE PACIFIST ETHIC AND HUMANISM (Student Peace Union Pamphlet.)
2. Harry Emerson Fosdick, THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, (Extension of Remarks of Hon. James P. Pope, of Idaho, in the Senate of the United States, Saturday, June 16, 1934) page 8.
3. Dr. Fred Schwarz, YOU CAN TRUST THE COMMUNISTS (to be Communists) (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall: 1960) pp. 86-90
4. Rodney D. Reyman, "God's Plan for World Peace," THE VOICE OF EVANGELISM (Ottumwa, Iowa: Vol. 11, No. 32, August 11, 1956) p. 255.
5. James Deforest Murch, CHRISTIANS ONLY, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1962) p. 153.

CHAPTER ONE

Viewing War from a Christian Standpoint

The matter of engaging in armed warfare may be viewed from a variety of standpoints, each one influenced to some degree by the individual's particular circumstances and prejudices. A very patriotic person will view war in the light of what he feels to be the best interests of his country. An ex-serviceman would naturally look at war from the experienced eye of an actual participant in all its horrors. The person who has lost a loved one in war is certain to be influenced emotionally by this incident. Others who have relatives presently serving in the armed services, especially in a dangerous war zone, will undoubtedly allow this circumstance to govern their outlook toward engaging in military conflict. With still others it may be a popular opinion, a stirring novel or perhaps one's background or temperament that affects his viewpoint one way or the other.

However strong any of these factors may be in shaping our thinking, none must take precedence over our profession as Christians. That which the Word of God requires of a Christian overrides all other factors in determining how he regards participation in war.

It is easy to follow the teaching of the Scriptures in matters that win the respect, admiration and envy of the world. It is not easy to do this when it brings only ridicule and misrepresentation from the non-Christian world. But the people of God must not allow the world's attitude to affect their actions. If a thing is right it should be practiced regardless of what others may think or say. If it is wrong it must be abstained from no matter what consequences may follow. This takes courage but this is the only kind of Christianity known in the New Testament!

A fundamental tenet of the religion of Christ is that a converted person becomes a new creature (II Corinthians 5:17). Old ideas and practices are discarded and replaced

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

by new ones. This "new creature" begins to view everything in a different light than he did before his conversion.

Christians are to have the mind of Christ (Philippians 2:5). This means that they are guided in their thinking and actions by the example of Christ Himself. Charles M. Sheldon powerfully illustrated this principle in his famous book, "In His Steps." Can we think of our Lord engaging in armed combat with those whom He created? The Christian must begin to view war from this standpoint!

A Christian is one who has been crucified with Christ (Galatians 2:20). As far as the world is concerned he is dead. As far as he is concerned the world is dead (Galatians 6:14). The world's method of solving its problems is not the standard which controls the Christian. He lives and acts in harmony with spiritual principles because he is led by the Holy Spirit (Galatians 5:18). This outlook is considered foolish to the unconverted person (I Corinthians 2:14) but is normal to the one whose nature has been changed (II Peter 1:4).

The Christian has become a partaker of the divine nature (II Peter 1:4). He is no longer motivated by the dictates of "human nature." The reins of God's Word now become the directing force in controlling a Christian's way of life. The child of God must not necessarily respond to his "natural impulses."

While the Christian lives among the people of the world, he does not champion every cause advocated by the world (James 4:4-5). His participation or non-participation in any activity will be determined by a "thus saith the Lord."

The New Testament Scriptures are virtually filled with teaching which shows that Christians are to think differently and act differently after conversion to Christ than they did before. This change is so far-reaching that it affects a person's social, physical, moral, economical, spiritual and religious standards of living. It is only reasonable to expect his attitude toward war to be affected by this radical change.

Lest anyone should think that he is excused from responsibility in this matter because of participating in a "group action", consider the following: All will stand before God to give account of his personal thoughts and deeds (Romans 14:10; II Corinthians 5:10). The final destiny of man will be determined on the basis of his

Viewing War from a Christian Standpoint

response to the teaching of Christ (John 12:48).

With these thoughts in mind, let us pursue our study of the Christian's relationship to carnal warfare, examining carefully each phase of the subject and drawing our conclusions from the standpoint of a consecrated Christian desiring to obey the Word of God.

CHAPTER TWO

A Christian and His Enemies

One of the basic tenets of the Christian religion is Love. And one of the most difficult and demanding expressions of that love is that which relates to a person's enemies. A prominent characteristic of the world is to vent hatred for one's avowed enemies. However, when Christ enters the life this attitude undergoes a radical change. One of the greatest demonstrations of the power of Christ working in a man is to see his hatred toward an enemy turn into love.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus stated this principle in the clearest terms. "Love your enemies," he said, "bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you" (Matthew 5:44). See also Luke 6:27, 35. It would be difficult to imagine how Jesus could have made this point any plainer.

Obviously, a Christian could not love his enemies and at the same time engage in armed warfare against them. Jesus emphatically stated that this love required that we "do good to them." Unfortunately, there are people who deride this injunction of Jesus by referring to those who are trying to obey it as "do-gooders." But no stretch of the imagination or rationalizing of the situation can make the horrible acts of war "doing good" to the enemy! War calls for inflicting the greatest amount of physical and moral harm upon the enemy with the primary intention of bringing about his utter ruin or surrender. Contrary to this, however, the Christian is required to bestow upon his enemies only such things which prove helpful to their physical and moral condition.

The great apostle Paul outlined specifically what this doing good to enemies involved when he said, "But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to

drink..." (Romans 12:20). There may be Christians who would consider this course of action "unreasonable" or "foolish" but, if the proper attitude of love exists in the heart, it will become the normal and natural way of treating an enemy. If this is not being practiced today, the fault lies in a lack of Christ-like love and not in a lack of understanding what the Bible teaches on the subject. The difficulty of carrying out any obligation is no valid argument for rejecting it.

The objection is often raised that when Jesus and Paul mention "enemies," they mean only such personal enemies as one might acquire in his day to day activities. This view holds that such enemies cannot refer to members of the military force of an opposing nation with which our country may be engaged in a declared or undeclared war. The reasoning follows that we are obliged to do good to personal enemies but that the Scriptures which teach this do not apply to enemy soldiers during wartime.

In reply to this it should be pointed out that the Greek word from which our English word "enemy" is translated is "ekthros", and is used thirty-two times in the New Testament. It is rendered as "enemy" and "foe", both in the singular and plural. It is significant to note that the same word is used in reference to both personal and national enemies.⁶

In Luke 19:41-44, Jesus laments the coming fate of the city of Jerusalem for having rejected him. In verse 43 he says, "For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank (trench, KJV) about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side." This is an unmistakable allusion to the Roman army, under Titus, as it besieged the city of Jerusalem prior to its fall in 70 A. D. Here the word "enemies" (from ekthros) refers to a national armed force preparing for a violent act of destructive war. This is the same word for the "enemies" whom the Christian is commanded to love. See also the prophecy of Zacharias, in Luke 1:67-79 where the term "enemies" is also used in a military sense, (although its use there appears to be figurative.)

But does war actually breed hatred of one's enemies? Does the physical and emotional training of fighting men instill in them compassion or contempt for their foes? Few men who have confronted the enemy in the heat of

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

fierce battle would hesitate in answering this question. Let a professional soldier of international reputation provide us with some insight into this matter.

General Dwight Eisenhower lamented the apathy of the public toward all-out war preparation which immediately preceded the attack on Pearl Harbor in December of 1941. He cited this attitude on the part of the people as a factor in making it more difficult to secure "toughened fighting men, emotionally and professionally ready for warfare."⁷

What did Eisenhower mean by "emotional" readiness for war? Just what kind of preparation do fighting men receive before going into battle? Does the army chaplain stand before the troops, as they assemble below the ship's deck arrayed in battle dress and prepared to land on an enemy beachhead, and urge them to remember the words of Jesus, "Love your enemies...do good to them that hate you"? Would the teaching of the Bible regarding a Christian's attitude toward his enemies be appropriate pre-battle instruction?

I well recall that tense morning in 1945 when I was assembled with army troops aboard an attack amphibious ship off the coast of Japan. The soldiers were dressed in full battle combat gear. Within an hour they would scramble over the side and into landing craft which would shuttle them ashore on one of the Japanese home islands. Although a formal treaty had been signed a few weeks earlier, these soldiers were briefed to expect a fanatic, last ditch stand by the Japanese since this was a remote area of the country which may not have heard of the official surrender of the nation's leaders.

What would the navy chaplain say to these grim men? Perhaps we should tell you what he did not say. He completely ignored any reference to the Bible's teaching on a Christian's attitude toward his enemies. He could not have mentioned this subject if those men were to hit that beach prepared to face an enemy they had been trained to hate. Emotionally they had to be made ready to kill or else suffer the same fate themselves. The Christian principle of love for enemies has no place in war.

To help you get an idea of the attitude toward one's enemies which is encouraged by war we reproduce the following article taken from the recent number of a religious magazine.

As part of the military training in World War II, the inductees were shown a film entitled "Kill or Be Killed." The picture, as I remember was vividly barbaric, and yet the U. S. Government knowing full well that most of us were reared in homes of reasonable peace and tranquility, felt that our minds as well as our bodies must be properly conditioned for mortal combat. After all, they reasoned, war is a matter of survival of the fittest and certainly the nation with the most people surviving would emerge victorious.

The film depicted the sadistic methods of fighting used by the enemy. Everything was fair! Nothing was too cruel! All rules for human dignity were completely forgotten -this was total war and our leaders wanted each of us to know it and to respond in like manner. It was appalling but later it proved to be the one great factor responsible for our survival. We had a mission to perform--it was a mission of death. We must fight the enemy with his own methods--we must fit ourselves for the right to live. "Kill or Be Killed," they said and it had to be the most important thing in our lives. They taught us well.⁶

Perhaps the best way to sum up the feelings which war arouses in a man toward his enemies is in the words of a sturdy, handsome South Vietnamese soldier, Nguyen Van Ham, 23 years of age. Interviewed by a newspaper correspondent concerning his role as a member of the South Vietnamese army he said, "I hate the Viet Cong, and I love my country. I have killed three Viet Cong. When I shoot them, I don't know why, but I feel very good...I still want to go more often into the field and kill the Viet Cong."⁹ This young man is a Roman Catholic.

In the face of the atrocities being committed by the Viet Cong, it is not too difficult to see why this young man is so strongly motivated to kill. But the teaching of Jesus still stands. While it may not be easy, yet the Word of God commands the Christian to love his enemies, and to act like it. This he cannot do and go to war against them.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER TWO

6. G. H. C. Macgregor, *THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS OF PACIFISM*, (Nyack, N. Y.: Fellowship Publications: 1960) page 47.

7. Dwight D. Eisenhower, *CRUSADE IN EUROPE* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc.: 1948) page 10.

8. Ike Henderson, "Think It Over," *CHRIST FOR THE WORLD FAMILY MAGAZINE* (Orlando, Fla.): (Vol. 28, No. 12, Dec. 1968) p. 19.

9. Orlando (Florida) Evening Star, Friday, July 16, 1965, p. 12-A

CHAPTER THREE

A Christian and Evildoers

One of the most frequent arguments used in an attempt to justify a Christian waging war is that "Evil-doers must be stopped in their aggressive efforts to overrun the world." Nearly every generation has had its Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Kaiser Wilhelm, Lenin, Hitler, Mussolini or Stalin. Certainly the atrocities perpetrated upon mankind by dictators who have aspired to world rule are to be deplored. Evil-doing of all kinds must be hated by Bible-believing Christians who desire to have the mind of Christ. It is said of Jesus, "Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity" (Hebrews 1:9).

But in the process of hating evil Christians are not permitted to despise the evil-doer also. This attitude is supremely exemplified in the act of God commending His "own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Romans 5:8). While man was busily engaged in the pursuit of evil, God was pursuing a course designed to effect man's eternal good. God loves sinners "even when we were dead through our trespasses" (Ephesians 2:4-5) and yet God says of evil, "all these are the things I hate" (Zechariah 8:17). Although God hates all evil, He loves the evildoer and has done only good to him, "for he is kind toward the unthankful and evil" (Luke 6:35).

The New Testament explicitly commands a Christian to "see that none render unto any one evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all" (1 Thessalonians 5:15). This forbids a child of God from committing an evil act even against the person who has mistreated him. This principle has been stated in the well-known proverb "two wrongs never make a right."

When the apostate Jews of Jesus' day attempted to

justify returning evil for evil by misapplying the Mosaic civil code requiring "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth," Jesus plainly told them, "resist not him that is evil" (Matthew 5:38-39).

War demands retaliation against evildoers. It calls for both offensive attack and defensive counterattack against an enemy bent on destruction. War requires putting a stop to his evil-doing. The prime means employed in war to accomplish this is for individuals to kill individuals. And this very action is forbidden to a Christian who is commanded by his Lord not to return evil to the one inflicting evil upon him.

Here again we are confronted with the objection that only "personal" evildoers are meant by these passages of Scripture. It is contended that the evil we might encounter in our personal contacts with our fellowman is to be tolerated but that the evil activities of an enemy nation during wartime may be responded to, in kind, by the Christian as an agent of the government. But can this allowance be upheld by the Scriptures?

In I Thessalonians 5:15 we are told to follow after that which is good toward "all." Romans 12:17-18 requires that we render to "no man" evil for evil, but rather to take thought for honorable things in the sight of "all men", and to be at peace with "all men." Now, unless these statements are somewhere in the New Testament qualified or restricted, then they must stand as clear-cut prohibitions preventing a Christian from rendering malicious evil to any and all men. This rule would apply to members of the community in which we live as well as members of an opposing army. Destructive violence and terror tactics are wrong whether they are carried on in a neighborhood scuffle or an international armed struggle. If not, why not?

Other passages which emphasize that Christians are not to engage in mutual hostility, such as war, are: Romans 12:21; I Peter 3:9; I Corinthians 4:12. While it may be freely admitted that in the open conflict of wartime it would be difficult (if not practically impossible) to engage in returning good for evil, that does not, therefore, permit rendering evil for evil.

Then there are those who still insist that evildoers must be dealt with as a matter of Justice. But in war there is no justice. Indeed, the very nature of warfare precludes

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

justice. Law, as ordained by Scripture, allows for a nation to govern its citizens, and even to punish the offenders among its citizens (Romans 13:1-7). But this, or any other passage of Scripture, gives no authority to one nation to judge another and then to administer "justice" by indiscriminately slaughtering its inhabitants.

War does not operate on the basis of justice. The evildoers, the true criminals responsible for desecrating mankind, are seldom, if ever, punished. Since the Bible indicates that evil men will wax worse and worse (II Timothy 3:13) we can expect the art of wanton human destruction to become more and more "refined."

War is gross injustice, waged on a worldwide scale, and Christians being just men (Hebrews 12:23) can have no part in it, regardless of how evil it may become.

In the end, however, evildoers will be punished. The Word of God settles the matter by stating that vengeance belongs to God. He will repay all injustices. Christians are warned to "Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto the wrath of God" Romans 12:19. And this is as it should be, for who else, besides Almighty God, could be impartially just and unerringly right?

Christians are strictly forbidden to "get back at" evildoers, even if they incite worldwide hostility in the form of war. God will punish the warmonger in His own time and way. This responsibility lies outside the realm of man. The Christian must respect God's authority in this matter and thereby have no part in war.

CHAPTER FOUR

A Christian and His Neighbors

"And who is my neighbor?", asked a Jewish law expert of Jesus, the greatest expert in God's law (Luke 10: 29). The answer came in the form of a beautiful parable which told of a man, who had been beaten and robbed, and was ignored by self-righteous religious leaders only to be thoughtfully cared for by a despised Samaritan traveler. The lesson which Jesus taught here was that a neighbor is one who needs our help.¹⁰ Barnes elaborates upon the aim of the parable by stating that "true religion teaches us to regard every man as our neighbor; prompts us to do good to all, to forget all national or sectional distinctions."¹¹ Lamar comments on Jesus' teaching in this parable thusly: "Humanity is our neighbor."¹² He points out that Jesus' emphasis was upon doing good to all men and that we should not only "have" neighbors but "be" neighbors.

Without question, Jesus' "Good Samaritan" story was intended to illustrate the Christian responsibility of being kind, considerate and helpful to all people.

Perhaps the clearest summary of Jesus' teaching was his requirement that men should love God with all their hearts and their neighbor as themselves (Matthew 22:36-40). He said that these two commandments were the greatest and, in effect, were the fulfillment of "the whole law" and "the prophets" (See also Mark 12:30-31).

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus pointed out that the Old Covenant also required love for neighbors. But under that law the Israelites apparently concluded that they were not obligated to love their enemies (Matthew 5: 43). This was no doubt the result of Jehovah commanding them not to seek the "peace" or "prosperity" of the Ammonites or Moabites (Deuteronomy 23:3-6). Also, they were told to "blot out the remembrance of Amalek

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

from under heaven" (Deuteronomy 25:19). To correct any possible misunderstanding, Jesus called for love even to one's enemies under the New Covenant. This being the case, there can be no question about what attitude to have toward neighbors.

In the Christian dispensation one of the most prominent characteristics of God's people is their sincere expression of love for their fellowman.

Now let us consider this "love thy neighbor" teaching as it relates to a Christian serving in armed warfare. A Christian regards every human being as an object of genuine love. He is to eagerly seek every possible opportunity to render needed service to him. He is to bestow upon him gladly whatever deeds of kindness he is able. He is even supposed to show his neighbor the same loving interest that he does to himself. This is the true meaning of Christ's doctrine of love for neighbor.

However, as a member of a military organization whose chief aim in wartime is to inflict hardship, privation, injury, and even death upon one's fellow-creatures, a Christian would certainly not be demonstrating neighborliness, according to Jesus' teaching.

Let us suppose that Christians lived in towns near the national borders of two countries which were at war with one another. These people would actually be "physical" neighbors, in the usual sense of the word. No doubt these people would be on friendly terms and bound together by strong ties of good will. In fact, as "small" as the earth has become, people can be literal neighbors around the world.

In such a war between "neighboring" countries these "neighbors" would necessarily be pitted against one another in armed combat. The very ones they had learned to love and respect would now become objects of their violence and brutality because their respective governments were at war. Could the Christian Scripturally participate in such activity against his neighbor? Must he now begin to exchange bombs and bullets in the place of gifts and best wishes? The whole issue boils down to this: Does war exempt the Christian from obeying Jesus' teaching on love for his neighbor? If it does, where in the New Testament is this exception taught? If this principle applies universally, then the Christian cannot war against his neighbor.

Notice that other inspired writers of the Scriptures teach the same thing. Paul said, "Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law" (Romans 13:8). In the ninth verse he lists some of the ten commandments (those which have to do with our relationship to others) and then says these are summed up in the command to "love thy neighbor as thyself." Then in verse ten, he expands on this idea by explaining that "Love does no wrong to one's neighbor—it never hurts anybody" (Amplified New Testament). The acts of war simply do not describe the type of conduct which Christians are required to show toward their neighbors.

In Galatians 5:14-15, Paul said that loving our neighbors as ourselves was the "one word" which fulfilled the whole law. He then added, "But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another." Here, in striking language, the apostle pictures the fierce, animal-like ravaging of armed warfare.

In order to carry out this principle, which James calls "the royal law" (James 2:8), the Christian cannot participate in war which knows nothing of the Christian ethic of love for neighbor.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER FOUR

10. B. W. Johnson, *THE PEOPLE'S NEW TESTAMENT WITH NOTES*, (Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Co.: n. d.) Vol. 1, p. 267.
11. Albert Barnes, *NOTES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT (Luke and John)*; (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Book House: 1960) p. 70.
12. J. S. Lamar, *THE NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY (Vol. II—Luke)*; (Dallas, Texas: Eugene S. Smith: n. d.) p. 160.

CHAPTER FIVE

A Christian and His Brethren

A distinguishing characteristic of Christians is their love for one another. Jesus said, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another" (John 13:34-35). Christianity is conspicuous for this quality, which is so pitifully lacking in the world. Notice that Jesus commands this love to be "as I have loved you." We are to love each other, as Christian brethren, the way that Christ loves us (John 15:12).

Christians are not only to love one another because Christ commands it (I John 3:23) but also out of deep appreciation for what our heavenly Father has done for us in sending Christ to be the covering for our sins (I John 4:9-11).

The second century writer Lucian said of Christians, "It is incredible to see the ardor with which the people of that religion help each other in their wants. They spare nothing. Their first legislator has put it into their heads that they are all brethren."¹³

Brotherly love is such a natural consequence of being a Christian that it hardly needs to be taught. Paul simply felt the need to exhort them to "abound more and more" in it (I Thessalonians 4:9-10). Love for our brethren is actually an evidence of having entered the new life in Christ (I John 3:14). Love of the brethren is not just a once-in-a-while attitude but is to "continue" (Hebrews 13:1). It is to be an expression of tender affection (Romans 12:10). It is to be sincere, heartfelt and intense according to I Peter 1:22. If this kind of love exists between Christians, it cannot help being seen.

Now it hardly needs to be said that a love like this would earnestly seek to "work that which is good" toward a brother in Christ (Galatians 6:10). But how does armed warfare fit into this loving relationship?

The activities of war place Christian brethren in such circumstances where brotherly love cannot exist. Suppose you were part of an army which was at war with another nation. As a soldier (or member of another branch of what is called collectively "the armed forces") it would be your responsibility to inflict damage and wreak havoc on the enemy in an effort to bring about his surrender. Suppose you were a Christian. Part of your job would be to contribute to the overall task of gaining the victory by whatever means your superiors considered most effective. This could include the bombing of such installations as bridges, dams, factories, highways, railroads or any other facility that would cripple the enemy and reduce his capacity for retaliation. In the process countless thousands of innocent civilians would be killed simply because they happened to live or work in the areas marked out for destruction. Even with precision equipment there is still a margin of error in hitting the intended target. This is seen in the fact that in World War II, entire villages of civilian population were totally wiped out.

Now suppose that some of these persons were Christians; those very ones whom your Master commanded that you should love dearly. Instead of acts of kindness and benevolence, your participation in war would call for bestowing upon them acts of violence and merciless death. Instead of love, you would be showing hate toward your brethren. And the Bible makes hating a brother equivalent to murder (I John 3:15). Bombing and strafing brethren is mass murder, regardless of how it might be "justified" as an act of war. War prevents Christians from acting like brethren!

Imagine two men, brothers in the Lord, participating in a war on opposing sides. Frequently the battle conditions of the foot soldier call for the grueling job of advancing into enemy territory at a painfully slow pace. Often towns and villages are captured block by block. The tattered, battle-weary soldier meets with the grisly task of encountering the enemy in face-to-face combat. Suddenly, over a heap of rubble in a bombed-out building, these two brothers meet! God has commanded them to love one another from the heart fervently. But each one has orders from his commanding officer to kill on sight all members of the opposing force. What are they to do?

It may be objected that since these two Christians

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

could not possibly know they were brothers, they should just fulfill their military duty and disregard the chance of killing a fellow-Christian. But this would be saying, in effect, "Since I can't know who might be a Christian, I will just kill and not worry about it." How could the conscience of a true child of God be at ease while doing this?

But let us suppose that these two soldiers did recognize each other as disciples of the Lord. And this would not be impossible, especially in a border war where Christian fellowship spans even international boundaries. It would be very conceivable for people of adjoining countries to know and love each other as members of Christ's church. So now they meet, as brethren, and yet as enemies. They are faced with the awesome choice of killing for country's sake or loving for Christ's sake. They are confronted with the decision to carry out their earthly commander's orders or to abide in their heavenly Savior's will. Which will it be?

Surely no Christian would desire to meet with such a circumstance. Even the faintest possibility of it occurring would be enough to cause the consecrated Christian to decline military service. Brethren cannot love one another, as the Bible teaches, and participate in war against each other. Thoughtful men can come to no other conclusion.

NOTE FROM CHAPTER FIVE

13. Wilbur Fields, *THINKING THROUGH THESSALONIANS*, (Joplin, Missouri: College Press: 1963) p. 109.

CHAPTER SIX

Participation in War and the “Golden Rule”

The “Golden Rule” is a popular term for the well-known passage of Scripture found in Matthew 7:12 which reads, “All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye also unto them.” With slight variation, it is more commonly quoted, “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.”

It would not seem that there could be any difficulty in understanding this verse. None of the words require consulting a dictionary to find out their meaning. No one feels compelled to resort to a commentary to discover what Jesus is trying to get across. Its application to the subject of armed warfare is all too obvious. But, perhaps, because of its very simplicity, it has been overlooked and its implications regarding a Christian and war have been entirely missed.

At the risk of over-simplifying it, let me state plainly that one cannot keep the “Golden Rule” and at the same time participate in the acts of war as part of a military force. War requires doing to others the very things which we would not want them doing to us. Nothing could be more opposite of the “Golden Rule” than the unrestrained destruction brought on by war. The very object of war is for one side to inflict as much devastation upon the enemy as possible while suffering the least in casualties to life and property itself. War operates on the same principle as the “hit-and-run” automobile mishap, the only difference being that war is “on purpose” while a pedestrian hit by a car is an “accident.”

Since it is a natural instinct for a human being not to want to be hurt or killed (Ephesians 5:29), the “Golden Rule” would lead a person not to want to injure or put to death anyone else. Since Christians, along with all civil-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

ized humans, are pleased to be treated with kindness and consideration, the "Golden Rule" would impel them to treat other people the same way. Jesus' teaching on the proper relationship of a Christian to his fellowman is totally incompatible with the requirements of war.

We often hear that the eventual aim of war is to bring about peace between nations and therefore Christians are justified in temporarily setting aside the "Golden Rule" in the interest of the overall good to humanity that would result when peace is finally "won." This is based on the false premise that "the end justifies the means." The idea is that, because long-range good is assured, short-range evil is permissible. The New Testament simply does not sanction this type of rationalizing in so serious a matter as the life and death of human beings. Even if it could be shown that war accomplishes some lasting good (and history does not bear this out), that would not override the Christian's obligation to treat others in harmony with Christ's teaching.

The apostle Paul was once faced with this same basic type of false reasoning. The Jews felt that if their sin was the cause of God extending His bountiful grace to man, then the more man sinned, the more of God's grace would be displayed. To this Paul replied, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid" Romans 6:1-2. In effect he is saying, "Just because something good and worthwhile comes about as a consequence of our sin, that does not justify us in continuing on in that sin."

This false principle of the world, if carried out to its logical end, would justify lying, stealing, cheating and even murder, so long as there was the possibility of some good resulting.

The "Golden Rule" teaching of Jesus allows no loophole through which Christians can justify treating others the way that war requires.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Participation in War and the “Great Commission”

“The Great Commission” is a common phrase used to describe a well-known portion of Scripture. These words refer to Matthew 28:18-20 which reads as follows: “And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you...” This is stated, in different wording, in Luke 24:46-47 and Mark 16:15-16. It is called “the Great Commission” because it consists of Jesus’ final charge to his apostles to carry the gospel message to all the world.

Mark’s account makes it especially clear that Jesus intended for every person to be evangelized and converted, for he says, “Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” Although originally given to the apostles, this commission was to become the “marching orders” of the entire church. According to Acts 8:1-4 we learn that the membership of Christ’s body had the responsibility to go “everywhere preaching the word.” So today, every Christian should recognize and accept his personal responsibility for winning as many lost persons to Christ as he possibly can.

Now with the nature of “the Great Commission” in mind and each Christian’s part in carrying it out, let us consider how this relates to participation in war.

To the Christian every individual should be viewed as a potential convert to Christ. This includes our next-door neighbor, those in the adjoining state or country, and even all those across the seas, in the islands and continents of the world. Remember, Jesus said, “preach the

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

gospel to every creature;" and "make disciples of all the nations."

But if a Christian engaged in war, he would be participating in killing the very ones to whom Jesus sent him to preach and baptize. Only those who are alive and able to hear and obey the gospel message can ever be saved. Romans 10:13-14. However, since war involves taking the lives of soldiers and civilians alike, it actually reduces the number of persons who will ever be able to hear, believe and obey the Gospel for salvation. So then, if you, as a Christian, were to participate in any effort of human slaughter (such as war), you would be thwarting the very purpose of "the Great Commission." The persons killed in war meet with sudden and unexpected death. They have no time or opportunity to make their lives right with God. To intentionally contribute to the death of a lost person in war, whether directly or indirectly, is to make it impossible for that person ever to be saved. His fate is sealed for eternity, outside the saving power of Christ.

Again, picture the Christian on a beachhead or in a jungle facing an enemy soldier. His government says, "Kill him." His conscience, instructed by the Word of God and prompted by the Holy Spirit, says, "Love him." Jesus, the captain of his salvation, says, "Preach to him." If he chooses to be an obedient soldier, he becomes a disobedient Christian. But if he determines to be an obedient Christian he would realize his obligation to "convert him" rather than to "kill him." Moreover, if the Christian, finding himself in this situation, would only have thought the matter through beforehand, he never would have been in such a perplexing position to start with.

By taking the life of another in war, a Christian not only disregards "the Great Commission" himself, but he makes it impossible for anyone else to carry it out as far as that individual is concerned. While a single Christian could never be expected to reach every person on earth with the Gospel, he should go to as many as he is able to personally, and then be willing to send others to the rest, Romans 10:14-15. But to participate in killing people absolutely prevents anyone from taking the good news of salvation to the victims of war.

This point was well taken by James D. Bales when he said, "No soldier who sees the enemy in his rifle sights

Participation in War and the "Great Commission"

can pull the trigger, and send him unprepared to eternity, if he views that enemy as a man for whom Christ died."¹⁴

Others, acquainted with the church's mission to evangelize the lost, have called attention to the same insurmountable problem. Moses Lard, writing at the close of the Civil War, observed that the rifle-bearing soldier "hurried into eternity" the souls of human beings who were spiritually "unprepared to die."¹⁵ More recently Wyatt Sawyer stated it so plainly when he said, about Christians killing lost men, "In doing so they destroyed forever the opportunity of the dead man to obey the gospel and be saved."¹⁶ Even Allen C. Isbell, who classes himself as a non-pacifist, admits in his recent book, "War and Conscience," that it would be disturbing to one's conscience for a Christian to participate in killing innocent people, which is an inevitable consequence of war.¹⁷ And certainly no child of God can live an acceptable Christian life with a conscience haunted by dozens or thousands of lost souls he ushered into eternity without Christ!

How inconsistent it is for the church to send some of its young men to a foreign country to preach the Gospel, and at the same time to send others to that country to kill its people in war. What a dilemma! Visualize these two armies marching forth to battle; one made up of soldiers of the "cross", bearing the message of hope and happiness to the lost masses, and the other made up of soldiers of the "crown", bearing the implements of death and destruction to the same undeserving multitude. How inconceivable to the mind of Christ and how unacceptable according to the Scriptures.

War frustrates evangelism because it nullifies "the Great Commission." The two cannot be successfully harmonized without doing violence to the plain teaching of the New Testament Scriptures.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER SEVEN

14. James D. Bales, P. W. Stonestreet, **BALES-STONESTREET DISCUSSION ON THE CHRISTIAN AND CARNAL WARFARE**, (Searcy, Arkansas: James D. Bales: 1947) page 134.

15. Moses E. Lard, "Should Christians Go To War?" **LARD'S QUARTERLY** (Kansas City, Mo.: Old Paths Book Club: 1950, reprint) Vol. 3, p. 231.

16. Wyatt Sawyer, "Can A Christian Fight For His Government?" **TEEN-AGE CHRISTIAN**, (Austin, Texas: TAC Publishing Co.: 1962) Vol. 3, No. 2, Feb. 1962, p. 17.

17. Allen C. Isbell, **WAR AND CONSCIENCE**, (Abilene, Texas: Biblical Research Press: 1966) p. 19.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Participation in War and Prayer

Prayer is a vital part of the Christian life. As a child of God the Christian has the privilege of requesting from his heavenly Father those things which he may legitimately desire. From its very beginning, the church continued steadfastly in prayer (Acts 2:42) and was later exhorted to "pray without ceasing" (I Thessalonians 5:17). Upon donning the "armor of God" the Christian soldier is urged to "pray always" (Ephesians 6:18). Prayer is everywhere in the Scriptures associated with true devotion to God.

Essentially, prayer is asking. One of the words for "pray" in the original Greek means "to ask, to make request." The idea of asking in prayer is clearly seen in such passages as I John 3:22; 5:14-15; and Philippians 1:4. While prayer certainly includes praising and thanking God, its basic idea is asking Him for our needs (Matthew 6:7-8).

New Testament teaching on prayer indicates that a Christian may include everything in his requests to God. The apostle Paul shows the unlimited bounds of prayer in Philippians 4:6 where he urges "But in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God." John adds that, in order for God to hear our requests, they must be asked "according to his will" (I John 5:14). Then James points out that some things are not granted "because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts" (James 4:3). From this we conclude that, while God invites us to ask for everything, such requests are necessarily limited to those things which are according to His will. One could not rightfully ask for something which the Scriptures forbid him to have and still expect God to grant it. A Christian could not hope to receive something in answer to his prayer with the intention of using it for a wicked

purpose. God is perfectly just in withholding certain things which are asked of Him. He cannot be a party to evil. If it were otherwise, God might justly be accused of providing man with greater convenience to commit sin.

Now notice these two important observations about prayer: (1) The Christian is to pray about everything. (2) The exceptions to this are such things which are not according to God's will. A logical conclusion, drawn from the above, would be that anything a Christian may not rightfully pray for would not be right for him to possess or practice. For example, one could not Scripturally pray for skill and success to perform a robbery because God has forbidden stealing. One could not pray for circumstances to work out well for seducing another man's wife because God has prohibited adultery. Whatever activity one may engage in must be in harmony with God's will in order to pray for it acceptably. Hence, whatever cannot be conscientiously and Scripturally prayed about must not be participated in.

Now here are some pointed questions which everyone who enters the armed forces must face squarely and honestly. As a Christian could you pray to God for success in carrying out your duties as a fighting soldier? Could you ask God for the skill to use deadly weapons to the best advantage in killing enemy individuals? Could you ask God to direct you as you aimed your high-powered rifle, your mortar or your hand grenade at people much like yourself, except they happened to be wearing a different uniform? Could you pray to get in the first thrust of your bayonet or the first chop with your combat knife during the close contact of jungle guerilla warfare? Could you pray for your supporting aircraft to make direct hits on an enemy machine-gun emplacement or to accurately strafe a wave of attacking foot-soldiers? Could you pray for these things with the assurance that they were according to the will of God?

Or could you request God's blessing on your bombing sortie even though you were well aware that many innocent women and children would be blown to bits, along with the primary industrial target? Could you pray for the speed, skill and maneuverability required for shooting down an enemy fighter plane, thus sending its pilot to certain death? Could you pray that a radio message you hurriedly sent would bring a rapid response re-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

sulting in the sinking of a menacing submarine which would send hundreds of men to their death? Could you pray for these things with the assurance that you were not asking amiss?

Now consider this matter from a different standpoint. As a member of a fighting force would you feel inclined to pray for the speedy recovery of enemy soldiers you helped to wound and maim? Would you pray for the loved ones of a dead soldier lying in the ditch along the roadside of a steaming jungle war zone — a soldier that you helped to kill? After seeing the terrified and weeping wife and children of the men whose lives you took in battle, would you feel led to pray that you could increase your “kill ratio” in the next village you attacked? How could you pray for God’s help to be with you in the accomplishment of the grisly and merciless tasks of war?

Suppose you were a Christian in the armed forces of your nation, dug in on an island beachhead thousands of miles from home—what would you pray for? Who would you pray for? Under such circumstances could you pray for “everything” connected with your day to day activities? Could you pray for them with the assurance that it was “according to God’s will?” Or would your mind be so confused and your body so weary and your attitude so embittered that you could not even pray at all?

In the comfort of your living room you can no doubt see the utter incompatibility of participating in war and praying for success in your endeavor. You can see that praying for evil to befall your enemy would not be acceptable prayer to God. But amid the bursting bombs and the thumping mortar fire of a far-flung battlefield, it might be a far different thing. Here you can see the inherent wrong in waging war. There, all you can see is the goal of your military objective—to fight and win—even if it means committing the worst kind of sins to accomplish it.

The time for Christians to think about participating in war and what the Bible teaches about it is now, before it is too late. It is easy to pray for peace now, but virtually unthinkable to pray for anything but victory, at any cost, in the heat of battle.

The nature of warfare is such that a Christian cannot Scripturally pray for its success. And if he cannot pray for success in waging it, he must not participate in it.

CHAPTER NINE

The Peaceful Nature of the Kingdom of God

Jesus taught that the church which he was to build and the kingdom of heaven were one and the same. This is made clear by his use of the terms interchangeably in Matthew 16:16-19. In Paul's writings he specifically says that Christians have been "translated into the kingdom" of Jesus Christ (Colossians 1:13). So Christ rules today over the lives of Christians who make up God's kingdom, the church. But what is the nature of this kingdom? May its subjects participate in warfare, with carnal weapons, and still have the approval of its King? In order to answer these questions, let us examine several Old Testament prophecies which point to the kingdom of Christ in the New Testament.

In Micah 4:1-4, we have a prophecy which contains the following elements: (1) Its fulfillment would occur in the last days (of political Israel, not of the world). (2) The mountain of the house of the Lord would be established (a reference to the kingdom or church). (3) People of all nations would flow into this kingdom. (4) Its law, the Word of God, would go forth from Jerusalem.

The fulfillment of this prophecy is found in the establishment of the church on the day of Pentecost and is recorded in the 2nd chapter of the Book of Acts. Briefly, here are the reasons why: (1) The events of Acts the 2nd chapter are said by the apostle Peter to have occurred on "the last days" (Compare Joel 2:28ff with Acts 2:17ff). (2) The church is repeatedly spoken of in the New Testament as the "house of God" (I Timothy 3:15; I Peter 4:17). (3) The church was to be composed of people of all nations (Mark 16:15; Matthew 28:19) and on the day of Pentecost there were people present from "every nation under heaven" (Acts 2:5). (4) The apostles were told to begin their preaching of the Gospel of the kingdom from

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

the city of Jerusalem (Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:4, 12).

Now let us notice an important element of the Micah prophecy. Among the nations who were to flow unto this "mountain of Jehovah's house" (the kingdom or church) there would be those who would "beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks" (Micah 4:3). It further states that "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." The references to "many nations" inviting people to come to the Lord's house (verse 2) and one "nation" not lifting up sword against another (verse 3) refer to the people from all nations who embrace this house of God. Zerr's Commentary says, "Many nations means people from many nations."¹⁸ This period of time does not refer to some golden age of the church on earth when everyone will be converted, nor does it refer to conditions in heaven. The context shows clearly that it is speaking of the church age which began on the day of Pentecost, as recorded in Acts 2, and which continues today. Thus, this prophecy tells of conditions in which we now live, when Christians from the various nations of the world will not take up arms to fight against each other.

Commenting on this prophecy, Larry Jonas said, in "The Pattern", "It need only be a time when church members in every nation give up weapons...This prophecy is to be fulfilled by all who obey Jesus."¹⁹ Here, then, appears a prophecy of the peaceful nature of the kingdom of Christ, in which Christians would not be engaged in carnal warfare.

Another prophecy bearing directly upon the peaceful nature of Christ's kingdom, the church, is found in Isaiah 11:1-10. That this passage alludes to the kingdom of Christ is seen by the fact that the apostle Paul quotes from this passage and applies it to Christ (Romans 15:12). Notice in Isaiah 11:6-9 that various wild animals are pictured as lying down together and even playing with children without harming them. Some have supposed that this refers to a future state of heavenly bliss, but recall that Paul attributes its fulfillment to the time when the Gentiles would have hope in Christ. This, of course, is the Christian dispensation, the church age in which we now live. The language of Isaiah describing the marvelous peace and contentment existing between animal life is simply prophetic imagery indicating the peaceful nature

of God's people in the kingdom of Christ. Wallace gives the following comment on this section of Scripture: "The wolf, the leopard and the lion are representative of the wicked and violent passions of men—the wild beasts of human character. It is a prophetic Gospel promise that such evil spirits should be subdued by the reign of the Prince of Peace in the hearts and lives of his subjects."²⁰

The above reference to Christ as "Prince of Peace" is taken from the unmistakable allusion to the Savior recorded in Isaiah 9:6-7. These prophecies, together with others which could be cited, show that Jesus' rule over the hearts of men in his New Testament kingdom would produce in them a nature totally adverse to the practices required by armed warfare. But so much for prophecy. Let us now turn our attention to the explicit teaching of the New Testament Scriptures concerning the peaceful nature of members of Christ's church.

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus bestowed his blessing upon the "peacemakers," stating that "they shall be called the children of God" (Matthew 5:9). Peace making was to be a notable characteristic of Christians. But members of the armed forces are rigorously trained in the art of war making. If, somehow, a fighting soldier could be considered a "peacemaker," then who should properly be classed as a "warmaker?" If being a peacemaker brings the promise of being called "children of God," what might those who wage war be called? Peacemakers do not fight, and warmakers are not peaceful!

Perhaps one of the clearest passages of Scripture showing that Christians are not permitted to engage in carnal warfare is found in II Corinthians 10:3-4. These verses state: "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds)." Paul here teaches that, although Christians live on earth in a human body, they are not to conduct themselves according to human standards. He does not deny that a Christian is at war, but he points out that the weapons used by the child of God are not the same as those used by non-Christians. The Christian is engaged in "the good fight of the faith," but he uses only those spiritual weapons which God mightily blesses in the overthrow of evil.

Weymouth translates this passage, "The weapons

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

with which we fight are not human weapons..." Taylor's "Living New Testament" paraphrases it in these words: "I use God's mighty weapons, not those made by men, to knock down the devil's strongholds." Phillips puts it this way: "The battle we are fighting is on the spiritual level. The very weapons we use are not those of human warfare but powerful in God's warfare for the destruction of the enemy's strongholds."

So the Christian is engaged in a spiritual battle, against spiritual enemies and therefore must use spiritual weapons. This same conflict is described by the figure of "wrestling" in Ephesians 6:12, "For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places." (American Standard Version) From this we can see that the Christian's struggle is against evil ideas; against wicked tendencies; against ungodly influences; against false philosophies; against all the powers of sin and wrongdoing.

Even though these are formidable enemies, the weapons to be used in combating them involve no violence or bloodshed. To insure victory in this spiritual battle, the New Testament Scriptures refer us to the proper equipment called "the armour of God." This armour consists of truth, righteousness, the Gospel of peace, faith, salvation, the Word of God and prayer (Ephesians 6:10-18). How different these weapons are from those used in human warfare! They are specially designed to cast down "imagination" and to capture "thoughts" with a view to bringing people to a "knowledge of God" and into "the obedience of Christ" (II Corinthians 10:5). They are to be used for elevating and blessing the spirit of man and not for harming or destroying his body. The nature, methods, equipment and aims of the Christian warfare are on a totally different plane than those of human warfare, which requires arms and violence to gain its temporal ends.

Carnal weapons are not used in a spiritual war, and spiritual weapons are powerless in a carnal war. The Christian is engaged in only one war, a spiritual one. He is authorized to use only one type of weapon by his Commander, spiritual ones. This means that he has absolutely no place participating in the carnal wars of men, fighting with fleshly weapons, devoted to a mere earthly cause,

however noble that cause may appear in the eyes of men.

Jesus made this principle clear on the occasion of his mock trial before Pilate. He said, "My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence" (John 18:36). Again we see the peaceful nature of the kingdom expressed by Christ himself. His disciples were forbidden to fight, even for the just cause of delivering the innocent Savior from the injustice of hateful men. Jesus acknowledged that if his kingdom had been as any other worldly kingdom, it would have been a natural consequence for his followers to engage in armed conflict to protect their king and to advance their cause. But Christians sustain such a relationship to Christ which demands that their primary allegiance be to him. If they are not permitted to fight to protect or promote his kingdom, how could they possibly be allowed to engage in a war involving a lesser, earthly kingdom? If a servant of Christ is forbidden to kill on behalf of the King of Kings, the Creator of the universe, how could he be allowed to kill on behalf of a temporal government led by fallible men? Unless it can be shown that earthly kingdoms take preeminence over the heavenly kingdom, it stands that whatever is not permitted for the highest order is certainly forbidden for all lower orders.

One incident in Jesus' life stands out as an example of the enforcement of this principle. As Jesus was being arrested in the garden of Gethsemane, one of his disciples drew a sword and attempted to slay one of the arresters. The blow failed to inflict a mortal wound and resulted only in severing the man's ear. Jesus immediately touched the ear and healed him, and then said to Peter, "Put up again thy sword into its place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matthew 26:52). Here is the case of a small band of disciples being accosted by an angry, armed mob intent on taking their leader to what appeared his certain death. If the use of a defensive sword on behalf of a righteous cause were ever justified, it would certainly have been proper in this instance. But Jesus said, "Put up again thy sword." By this command the Lord disarmed every person who would resort to unrestrained, destructive violence as a means of accomplishing his aim.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

Jesus was not denying the use of the sword simply because he realized that his earthly mission required submitting to death, for he gives, as the reason, a universal principle. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword" is equivalent to saying, "Killing is futile, for it only results in being killed." This principle holds true generally whether death comes through the vengeance of a victim's friends or whether it comes from an enemy soldier on the battlefield of war. Jesus denies the use of a deadly weapon for the purpose of maliciously killing people. And this prohibition serves as another stone in the mountain of New Testament teaching which restricts a Christian from participating in armed warfare.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER NINE

18. E. M. Zerr, BIBLE COMMENTARY, (St. Louis, Mo.: Mission Messenger: 1955) Vol. 4, p. 327.
19. Larry Jonas, "Nationalistic Militarism," THE PATTERN (Vancouver, Wash.: Vol. 7, No. 11, Nov. 1, 1964)
20. Foy E. Wallace, Jr., GOD'S PROPHETIC WORD, (Oklahoma City: Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Publications: Revised edition, 1960) p. 492.

CHAPTER TEN

The Fruit of the Spirit versus The Fruit of War

True Christianity is more than simply a profession—it is a production. When persons are converted to Christ, they are known, not only for speaking differently, but for acting differently as well. An ever-increasing number of highly desirable virtues begin to manifest themselves in the Christian's life and conduct. These are the direct result of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit which is given, as a gift, to each person upon his baptism into Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38). These spiritual qualities develop in the course of normal growth in the Lord. Just as a maturing tree begins to bear fruit, so a Christian bears the "fruit of the Spirit" as he advances to spiritual manhood.

This fruit consists of "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, goodness, kindness, meekness, faithfulness and self-control" (Galatians 5:22, the American Standard Version). Christians individually and the church collectively will demonstrate this fruit in every phase of life and thought. Jesus taught the principle that people are known by the fruit they bear (Matthew 7:15-20). Wicked men are recognizable by their evil deeds. On the other hand, those who are led by the Spirit of God will indicate that by their actions of doing right. Let us consider this principle as it relates to war.

Wherever warring armies meet it leaves a devastating effect upon society. It produces an indelible mark upon the people of all nations involved. War leaves in its wake observable effects upon both life and property. There is hardly a spot on earth where the influence of some kind of war is not making itself felt.

A recent issue of "Time Magazine" listed forty wars of varying sizes and intensities that have broken out during the twenty year period between 1945 and 1965. These wars, by their very nature, are bearing fruit of some kind.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

It is this fruit that we want to observe and compare with the fruit borne by the Holy Spirit. If the fruit can be shown to be holy and righteous, according to New Testament standards, then the Christian should, by all means, participate in it. If, on the other hand, the fruit of war can be seen to be evil, the Christian is to have no part in it (I Thessalonians 5:22).

In this chapter we want to call attention to some pertinent comments on the nature of war and the character of its effects upon society. These remarks will consist of observations made by respected men in the military, political, literary and religious fields.

It was the renowned statesman, Benjamin Franklin, who once said, "There never was a good war or a bad peace." If war is not good, how can it be engaged in when the fruit of the Spirit includes "goodness" (Ephesians 5:22)? Love, which is another fruit of the Spirit, is said elsewhere in the Scriptures to be "shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit" (Romans 5:5). Compare that with what David Starr Jordan, first president of Stanford University, said some years ago; "War is the expression of unreasoned anger, coordinated and legalized violence to accomplish political ends." Karl von Clausewitz, who was a prominent Prussian military officer and author of the book, "Of War," once said: "War is an act of violence, which, in its application, knows no bounds." The fruit of the Spirit is love and peace while the fruit of war is hatred and violence. This should be so obvious to the candid mind that we risk being accused of laboring the point to so emphasize it.

It would be extremely difficult to name any other one activity that embraces so much in it that is contrary to the standards of Christianity. Major General John O'Ryan, a one time United States military officer, made this crushing indictment of war: "War is not only the denial of Christianity, but of all the most sacred things of life." J. B. Remensnyder pointed out several reasons why war is so opposed to Christianity when he said, "War is antagonistic to Christianity for many reasons, but chiefly on account of the ugly passion it excites and the untold misery that it inflicts." Dr. William E. Channing, a noted 19th century preacher and writer, once enumerated the fruits of war in a manner similar to the way that the apostle Paul listed the fruit of the Spirit. Channing said,

The Fruit of the Spirit Versus the Fruit of War

"War is the concentration of all human crimes. Under its standard gather violence, malignity, rage, fraud, perfidy, rapacity and lust. If it only slew men, it would do little. It turns man into a beast of prey."

Perhaps one of the most sweeping charges on record against war comes from Sidney Smith, who stated: "God is forgotten in war; every principle of Christianity is trampled upon." Dr. Adam Clarke, well-known Bible scholar and author of "Clarke's Commentary," put it bluntly, "War is as contrary to the spirit of Christianity as murder."

As strange as it may seem, the extremely evil nature of war is often least expressed by those most familiar with its true character. Perhaps this is the result of military men, whether consciously or unconsciously, rationalizing on the subject in an effort to avoid being overwhelmed by the horror of it all. But William James, the distinguished Harvard philosopher and author, quotes several brutally frank statements of military men. To von Moltke, a German military genius of yesteryear, he attributes the following candid sentiment: "The immediate aim of the soldier's life is destruction, and nothing but destruction; and whatever constructions wars result in are remote and non-military. Consequently the soldier cannot train himself to be too feelingless to all those usual sympathies and respects, whether for persons or things, that make for conservation." What an admission! But truly successful soldiering demands just such "feelingless" and unsympathetic attitudes toward persons and things. So, into the steaming jungles go the weary foot soldiers on their grim, but routine, "search and destroy" missions. How opposite this is to the compassion for others produced by the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of a true Christian!

William James then goes on to give an even more striking insight into the nature and character of an ideal fighting man when he quotes an Austrian officer as follows: "Live and let live is no device for an army. Contempt for one's own comrades, for the troops of the enemy, and, above all, fierce contempt for one's own person, are what war demands of every one. Far better is it for an army to be too savage, too cruel, too barbarous, than to possess too much sentimentality and human reasonableness. If the soldier is to be good for anything as a

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

soldier. he must be exactly the opposite of a reasoning and thinking man...The recruit brings with him common moral notions, of which he must seek immediately to get rid...The most barbaric tendencies in men come to life again in war, and for war's uses they are incommensurably good."²¹ While not every person who becomes a soldier attains this degree of ruthlessness, what experienced warrior, who has weathered the fierceness of pitched battle, would deny that just such a man makes the most effective "killer?"

Think for a moment of the most efficient fighting man. What would be his qualities? Would he not have to be devoid of common moral sentiments toward others? Would he not have to be utterly ruthless and unmerciful in his battle tactics? Would he not actually rise to the fever pitch of a savage in the intense heat of combat? Would he not have to develop the capability of instinctive retaliation against the oncoming enemy and that without the slightest reservation? Would he not be a human bomb of destructive force guided, not by reason, but by an all-consuming urge to achieve his military objective, regardless of the cost?

I once interviewed a veteran of the southwest Pacific theater of operations during World War II. He was then a patient in a Veterans Hospital, dying of lung cancer. He recounted how the Japanese soldiers came surrendering, on their knees with hands clasped behind their heads, on the island of New Guinea. He said his, and the feelings of the other capturing soldiers, were so strong that they approached the kneeling captives and shot them, at point blank range, in the head. When I asked him about how many he personally shot that way he said he could not recall. But following that engagement he was removed to a hospital for mental treatment which he indicated was the result of such gruesome experiences. And even worse treatment of American soldiers was shown by the Japanese because that is war!

Could such actions, by any stretch of the imagination, be said to stem from the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit? Could God's Spirit produce in the person engaged in armed conflict those qualities necessary to win in the dirty game of war where no holds are barred and "all is fair?" Obviously, that which is produced in the soldier by war is incompatible with that which is pro-

duced in the Christian by the Holy Spirit!

But just how would participation in war effect a true Christian if he were to engage in it? Unfortunately, statistical data on this are not readily available. But a survey was made on a number of professing Christians by the London Congregational Union during World War II which revealed the following: "About a third of those questioned (members of the armed forces) indicated that the deadening influence of life in the armed forces, combined with the sense of incongruity between Christian ideals and the destructiveness of war, made their religious life seem unreal."²²

An apt illustration of this unspiritual effect of war upon a Christian is seen in the instance of James A. Garfield, twentieth president of the United States. Garfield had been a preacher among churches of Christ prior to his entering the Union Army during the Civil War where he fought so gallantly that he rose to the rank of General. But due to the experiences he went through in that terrible war a marked change took place in his spiritual life. It is said that, following that period of his life, Garfield never entered the pulpit again.²³

Without question, then, the fruit of war must be considered unrestrained brutality. Lord Stanley Baldwin, former Prime Minister of Great Britain, once said, "The only defense is offense, which means that you have to kill women and children more quickly than the enemy if you want to save yourselves."

Erasmus, the great Dutch scholar, asserted, "War is the blackest villainy of which human nature is capable."

John Wesley, the renowned founder of Methodism, stated it in similar words when he said, "War is the sum total of human villainies."

Napoleon, certainly a man who knew war, called it "the trade of barbarians" and William T. Sherman, famed Civil War General, said all too truly, "War is hell."

The fruit of the Spirit and the fruit of war are exact opposites of one another, and can never be reconciled. The New Testament asks the question which every Christian must be compelled to answer in the negative, "What fellowship have righteousness and iniquity?" (II Corinthians 6:14).²⁴

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

NOTES FROM CHAPTER TEN

21. William James, **THE VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE**, (New York: Random House "The Modern Library": 1929) pp. 358-359.
22. Culbert G. Rutenber, **THE DAGGER AND THE CROSS**, (Nyack, New York: Fellowship Publications: 1958) p. 56.
23. David Lipscomb, **CIVIL GOVERNMENT**, (Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Company: 1957) p. 139.
24. Quotations of famous people regarding war in this chapter were taken mainly from the following works: Theodore Epp, **SHOULD GOD'S PEOPLE PARTAKE IN WAR?** (Inman, Kansas: Salem Publishing House: Third Edition, 1949) pp. 32-35; H. Leo Boles, **THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON WAR**, (Nashville, Tenn.: Gospel Advocate Company: no date) pp. 55-58; James D. Bales and P. W. Stonestreet, **THE CHRISTIAN AND CARNAL WARFARE**, (Searcy, Ark.: James D. Bales: 1947) p. 180.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

Jesus Prophecies Neutrality for Christians

The scene is Jerusalem. The time is the last week of Jesus' earthly ministry. As Jesus was leaving the Temple, early that week, one of his disciples called his attention to the beauty and splendor of this magnificently adorned edifice. Their observation brought from the lips of Jesus the astounding prediction that someday it would all be totally destroyed! In fact, he emphasized that it would be so thoroughly demolished that one stone would not even be left upon another. This statement so intrigued the apostles that Peter, James, John and Andrew later came to Jesus privately and inquired of him additional information about His outstanding prophecy.

Their question seems to be fourfold: (1) When would the Temple be destroyed? (2) What signs would precede its destruction? (3) What sign would signal Christ's return? (4) What sign would usher in the end of the world? While Jesus had not specifically mentioned his second coming, nor the end of the world, his prediction of the destruction of the Temple seemed so tremendous they could not help but associate it with the final end of all things. (Jesus' predictions, the apostles' questions and the Lord's explanation are recorded in Matthew 24:1-51; Mark 13:1-37; and Luke 21:5-38).

It is generally agreed by Biblical scholars that these chapters deal with the two principal topics of (1) The destruction of Jerusalem (including the entire demolishing of the Temple buildings) and (2) The second coming of Christ. In this chapter we are especially concerned with a statement Jesus made with respect to the destruction of Jerusalem.

But before we consider this statement let us call attention to the amazing accuracy with which Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the Temple buildings was

fulfilled. Jesus said in Matthew 24:2 that "There shall not be here left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Dr. A. T. Pierson, in his book on Christian apologetics, makes this observation on the complete accuracy, to the minutest detail, of this prediction. Regarding the total ruin of the buildings comprising the Temple enclosure when Jerusalem was overrun by the Roman army in 70 A. D. he writes: "The hope of finding hid treasure moved the Roman army to tear up the very ground, till sewers and aqueducts were uncovered, and a plowshare was used to tear up the foundations of the Temple, thus literally fulfilling the prophecy of Micah (750 B. C.) 'Jerusalem shall be ploughed as a heap' ".²⁵ This is simply one of many remarkable fulfillments of Jesus' prophecies of the destruction of Jerusalem. "The History of the Jews" by Flavius Josephus is replete with incidents which he personally observed during the siege of Jerusalem prior to 70 A. D. and which constitute a detailed fulfillment of Jesus' words spoken on that memorable occasion.

Now let us turn our attention to a specific prophecy made by Jesus on this same occasion which bears directly on a Christian's relationship to war. In speaking to his disciples, Jesus gave this solemn warning, "But when ye see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that her desolation is at hand." This is recorded in Luke 21:20. (Notice that the doomed city of Jerusalem is referred to as "her.") At this exact point in the prophecy of Jesus, Matthew's account (24:15) and Mark's account (13:14) inject a warning to their readers (since they were both written before the prophecy was fulfilled in 70 A. D.). They add in parentheses, "(let him that readeth understand)." McGarvey comments on this parenthetical statement in this way, "The words are, therefore, exhortations by the Evangelists Matthew and Mark, bidding their readers take heed to this part of the prophecy (which constituted the last sign, and therefore, the final warning) that they might not share in the bitter fate impending over Jerusalem and Judea if they chanced to be in either in the hour of judgement."²⁶ So, with Jerusalem soon to be completely overrun and devastated, those disciples to whom Jesus spoke, as well as those who were to read the written record of this prophecy, needed inspired guidance

as to what course of action to take in order to survive. Just such divine guidance is here given by the Lord Jesus Christ. The instructions Jesus gave his disciples concerning their conduct during the Roman war of 66-70 A. D. holds a principle which serves as a guide to Christians for all generations.

Now notice Jesus' specific instructions as recorded in Luke 21:21; "Then let them that are in Judea flee unto the mountains." The poor victims of this impending disaster were not merely to take refuge in the hills of Judea, which would be infested with Roman troops, but were to flee beyond Judea, into the mountains. Note that! Then Jesus went on to urge, "And let them that are in the midst of her (referring to Jerusalem, v. 20) depart out; and let not them that are in the country enter therein." (Luke 21:21).

Here is the situation. The Christians who found themselves trapped within the besieged city had one of two choices open to them if they had been minded to engage in warfare. They could have joined in with the defenders of the Jewish garrison or they could have cooperated with the invading Roman hordes. But Jesus' prophecy, made over thirty years before, provided these Christians with God's divine will for them under such circumstances. They were to remain neutral. Christ had specifically enjoined them to have no part in the armed hostilities on either side. Their sole responsibility was to obey their Lord who required them to flee from the doomed city and even to leave the province of Judea itself.

What was the outcome? Happily, the record has been preserved. Eusebius, the fourth-century "father of church history," tells us that "the whole body of the church at Jerusalem," in obedience to the clear instructions of Jesus Christ, as recorded in Luke 21, fled to Pella, a village about sixty miles northeast of Jerusalem. This was completely outside of Judea and on the east side of the Jordan River. The following photo copy is a quotation from the works of Eusebius on this important incident.²⁷

The death of the rest of the Apostles was plotted in numerous ways and they were driven from the land of Judaea, and they went their way to teach the Gospel among all the nations, supported by the power of Christ, who said to them: 'Going teach ye all nations in my name.'⁵ But the people of the Church at Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given out by revelation before the war to esteemed men there to depart from the city and to inhabit a city of Peraea which they called Pella.⁶ Those who believed in Christ migrated to this city from Jerusalem, that, when holy men had entirely abandoned the royal capital of the Jews and the entire land of Judaea, the judgment of God might soon overtake them for their many crimes against Christ and His Apostles and utterly destroy that generation of the wicked from among men. Whoever wishes can gather accurately from the history written by Josephus⁷ how many evils everywhere overwhelmed the entire nation at that time; and how especially the inhabitants of Judaea were driven to an extremity of misfortunes; and how many thousands of youths, together with women and children, perished by the sword and by hunger

⁵ Cf. Acts 6.8ff. and 12.2.

⁶ Cf. above, 2.23.

⁷ Cf. Matt. 28.19. Eusebius usually omits the reference to baptism when quoting this passage. Some think that he is following a text in an earlier form; others, that he wished to keep the formula of baptism secret.

⁸ In northern Perea, beyond the Jordan, within the territory of Herod Agrippa II. Epiphanius (*De Pond. et Mens.* 15) also mentions this flight of the Christians to Pella. The people in the vicinity of Pella were for the greater part Gentiles.

⁹ Josephus, *B.J.* Bks. 5 and 6.

If someone wonders how anyone could possibly escape from Jerusalem during a seige that completely surrounded the city with Roman armies, history affords the answer. Let us examine the accounts recorded in the works of Flavius Josephus, a Jewish annalist who lived and wrote during the very time when all these calamities befell Jerusalem.

Some time prior to 66 A. D. a Roman officer named Cestius Gallus marched against Jerusalem, laying seige to the city. It seems that Cestius failed to realize that he had

considerable sympathetic support from within the city that could have allowed him to take it with little difficulty. So instead of continuing his siege Cestius "recalled his soldiers from the place, and by despairing of any expectation of taking it, without having received any disgrace, he retired from the city, without any reason in the world."²⁸ At this point in Josephus' narrative, his translator, William Whiston, calls attention in a footnote to the prediction of Jesus and suggests that this occasion afforded the Jewish Christians the opportunity to flee from the city and thereby escape destruction. Indeed, the very next chapter of Josephus graphically describes just such a departure in these words: "After this calamity had befallen Cestius (that is, his being driven off by the Jews), many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city, as from a ship when it was going to sink."²⁹ These "Jews" could certainly have had reference to those Christians who were following Jesus' warning to "flee to the mountains."

Then after the final siege of Jerusalem had begun, under Vespasian from 66 to 70 A. D., another incident occurred that would have allowed Christians to escape the destruction that awaited the besieged city. In the early summer of 68 A. D. Vespasian received the news that the Roman Emperor Nero had died. He was approaching the city at the time bent on its destruction. Upon hearing that Nero was dead Vespasian immediately withdrew his armies and due to the fluctuating condition of the Roman empire at that time, the expedition against Jerusalem was temporarily postponed.³⁰ This undoubtedly afforded Christians another opportunity to abandon the city as Jesus had directed.

To climax the entire, amazing affair, historians tell us that not a single Christian perished in the final overthrow of Jerusalem when it was destroyed in 70 A. D. Such astonishing deliverance all came about because those early disciples took literally the warning of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, and fled the scene of armed conflict.

Thus we have a divinely given precedent for guiding Christians of all ages who may be found in similar circumstances. When caught in the midst of a war, Christians can know with certainty what the will of Christ is for them to do. When war comes they are not to bear arms, either defensively or offensively. Instead, they are to

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

assume a neutral position rather than to take up carnal weapons with which to kill. This is the will of Christ. Jesus' prophecy should settle the issue for conscientious Christians. The historical account of the early Christians carrying out His instructions should serve as an example to be followed by us today. Participation in armed warfare simply does not harmonize with the will of Christ as revealed by His teaching.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER ELEVEN

25. Arthur T. Pierson, *MANY INFALLIBLE PROOFS*, Vol. I, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House: no date) p. 54.
26. J. W. McGarvey, and Philip Y. Pendleton, *THE FOURFOLD GOSPEL*, (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Foundation: no date:) pp. 624-625.
27. Eusebius, *THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH*, "Eusebius Pamphili, Ecclesiastical History" Book 3, Chapter 5 (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc.: 1953) page 145.
28. Flavius Josephus, *WORKS*, The Wars of the Jews, Book II, Chapter 19, Paragraphs 6-7: Translated by William Whiston (New York: A. L. Burt, publisher: no date) Vol. III, pp. 203-204.
29. Josephus, op. cit., Book II, Chapter 20, Paragraph 1, (Vol. III, p. 206).
30. Flavius Josephus, *WORKS*, The Wars of the Jews, Book IV, Chapter 9, Paragraphs 1-2: Translated by William Whiston (New York: A. L. Burt, publisher: no date) Vol. III, pp. 331-333.

CHAPTER TWELVE

The Attitude of Early Christians Toward War

As we try to determine what a Christian's attitude toward war should be today it would be helpful to consider how Christians felt toward war in the beginning days of Christianity. Fortunately we have numerous writings from men who lived and wrote immediately following the days of the apostles. These writings afford a clear picture of both the attitude and conduct of members of the church of Christ for the first three hundred years of its existence.

Historians are generally agreed that when the apostles and their converts were still alive the church maintained a relatively high degree of purity in life and doctrine. If we can learn how those early Christians felt about participating in war, during and immediately following the time when inspired men were still among them, we should be able to understand better just what the original stand of the church was on the matter of war.

In this chapter we want to give careful consideration to the observations of church historians who have given years of thorough research into the beliefs and practices of the early Christians and their attitude toward war. Then we will cite, by means of photo copy, statements from the writings of early church leaders and even from unbelievers showing how war was viewed by Christians in the beginning days of the church. Such insights will no doubt prove beneficial in recapturing today the convictions of primitive Christianity in its purest form.

On the basis of material compiled by the most learned and reliable authorities on conditions in the early church we conclude that Christians did not participate in the armed forces, in any way, until at least about 174 A. D. C. J. Cadoux, acknowledged as the best authority on the subject, said, "No Christian ever thought of enlist-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

ing in the army after his conversion until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (A. D. 161 to 180) at earliest."³¹ Hershberger verifies this statement by saying, "It is quite clear that prior to about A. D. 174 it is impossible to speak of Christian soldiers."³² Still another voice may be added to testify that Christians participating in war was unheard of in the early church. Bainton tells us, "From the end of the New Testament period to the decade A. D. 170-180 there is no evidence whatever of Christians in the army."³³

This silence regarding Christians engaging in war during those early years is most naturally explained by the fact that this was the period when the apostles and their contemporaries lived and wrote. It is to be expected that those early disciples of Christ would have adhered to the teaching of these inspired men. Any question arising over the matter of war and the Christian was no doubt answered promptly by an inspired utterance. In addition, the conditions of extreme persecution against the church in that day would suggest a high state of spirituality among those who remained faithful. With this kind of devotion it is not difficult to understand why killing as a government agent would appear extremely obnoxious to those suffering saints. The government was beating and killing them. Why should they wound and kill others for the government, especially since their leaders were teaching them just the opposite?

But from about 174 A. D. on to the time of Constantine, about 313 A. D., there are indications that a few Christians were in the military service. Hershberger says, "Beginning about the year A. D. 174, however, there were Christians in the Roman army."³⁴ The reason we know that a few Christians were in the army during this period is that the leaders of the church are found to be very outspoken in their opposition to this practice in their writings. Bainton calls our attention to this in saying, "The period from A. D. 180 until the time of Constantine exhibits both in the East and West a number of more or less explicit condemnations of military service."³⁵

So from about 180 A. D. onward we find the statements of many writers, both in and out of the church, which show that Christians serving in the military was a practice beginning to creep into the church. You will recall that prior to this period all evidence points to non-participation in war by Christians.

Let us now examine the writings of some of these early church leaders who are popularly known as "church fathers" in the literature of church history. You will notice that we are here reproducing photo copies of their exact quotations as taken from original sources available in religious reference libraries. These quotations will show clearly the attitude of the early church to participating in war.

JUSTIN MARTYR (writing about 150 A. D.):^{36, 37}

254

DIALOGUE W

High, shall venture to do unlawful deeds on the earth against us the Christians, who, having learned the true worship of God from the law, and the word which went forth from Jerusalem by means of the apostles of Jesus, have fled for safety to the God of Jacob and God of Israel; and we who were filled with war, and mutual slaughter, and every wickedness, have each through the whole earth changed our warlike weapons, — our swords into ploughshares, and our spears into implements of tillage, — and we cultivate piety, righteousness, philanthropy, faith, and hope, which we have from the Father Himself through Him who was crucified; and sitting each under his vine, i.e., each man possessing his own married wife. For you are aware that the prophetic word says, 'And his wife shall be like a fruitful vine.' Now it is evident that no one can terrify or subdue us who have believed in Jesus over all the world. For it is plain that, though beheaded, and crucified, and thrown to wild beasts, and chains, and fire, and all other kinds of torture, we do not give up our confession; but the more such things happen, the more do others and in larger numbers become faithful, and worshippers of God through the name of Jesus. For just as if one should cut away the fruit-bearing parts of a vine, it grows up again, and yields other branches flourishing and fruitful; even so the same thing happens with us. For the vine planted by God and Christ the Saviour is His people. But the rest of the proph

by Christ to teach to all the word of God ; and we who formerly used to murder one another do not only now refrain from making war upon our enemies, but also, that we may not lie nor deceive our examiners, willingly die confessing Christ. For that saying, "The tongue has sworn, but the mind is unsworn,"¹ might be imitated by us in this matter. But if the soldiers enrolled by you, and who have taken the military oath, prefer their allegiance to their own life, and parents, and country, and all kindred, though you can offer them nothing incorruptible, it were verily ridiculous if we, who earnestly long for incorruption, should not endure all things, in order to obtain what we desire from Him who is able to grant it.

From this it can be seen that in Justin Martyr's time Christians were neither filled with war nor did they make any use of the weapons of carnal warfare. Notice also that Justin even makes use of the prophecy in Micah 4:3 in saying that Christians had changed their "swords into plowshares." Furthermore he indicates that this was a universal practice "through the whole earth" and that Christians willingly suffered death rather than making war against their enemies.

TERTULLIAN (writing about 200 A. D.):^{38, 39}

CHAP. XI.

To begin with the real ground of the military crown, I think we must first inquire whether warfare is proper at all for Christians. What sense is there in discussing the merely accidental, when that on which it rests is to be condemned? Do we believe it lawful for a human oath⁴ to be superadded to one divine, for a man to come under promise to another master after Christ, and to abjure father, mother, and all nearest kinsfolk, whom even the law has commanded us to honour and love next to God Himself, to whom the gospel, too, holding them only of less account than Christ, has in like manner rendered

honour? Shall it be held lawful to make an occupation of the sword, when the Lord proclaims that he who uses the sword shall perish by the sword? And shall the son of peace take part in the battle when it does not become him even to sue at law? And shall he apply the chain, and the prison, and the torture, and the punishment, who is not the avenger even of his own wrongs? Shall he, forsooth, either keep watch-service for others more than for Christ, or shall he do it on the Lord's day, when he does not even do it for Christ Himself? And shall he keep guard

⁸[He plays on this word *Sacramentum*. Is the military *sacrament* to be added to the Lord's?]

There is no agreement between the divine and the human sacrament," the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the camp of light and the camp of darkness. One soul cannot be due to two *masters*—God and Caesar. And yet Moses carried a rod," and Aaron wore a huckle," and John (Baptist) is girt with leather," and Joshua the son of Nun leads a line of march; and the People warred: if it pleases you to sport with the subject. But how will a *Christian man* war, nay, how will he serve even in peace, without a sword, which the Lord has taken away?" For albeit soldiers had come unto John, and had received the formula of their rule; albeit, likewise, a centurion had believed; still the Lord afterward, in disarming Peter, unbelted every soldier. No dress is lawful among us, if assigned to any unlawful action.

By a series of questions Tertullian shows the utter impossibility of a Christian making "an occupation of the sword" on behalf of Caesar when he would not even bring a law suit or avenge a personal wrong. He alludes to Jesus' prohibition of sword bearing issued to Peter at the time of our Lord's arrest in Gethsemane (Matthew 26:52) as a basis for unbelted every soldier, even in peacetime.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

IRENÆUS (writing about 200 A. D.):⁴⁰

people; and they shall break down their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and they shall no longer learn to fight." If therefore another law and word, going forth from Jerusalem, brought in such a [reign of] peace among the Gentiles which received it (the word), and convinced, through them, many a nation of its folly, then [only] it appears that the prophets spake of some other person. But if the law of liberty, that is, the word of God, preached by the apostles (who went forth from Jerusalem) throughout all the earth, caused such a change in the state of things, that these nations did form the swords and war-lances into ploughshares, and changed them into pruning-hooks for reaping the corn, [that is], into instruments used for peaceful purposes, and that they are now unaccustomed to fighting, but when smitten, offer also the other cheek; then the prophets have not spoken these things of any other person, but of Him who effected them. This person is our Lord, and in Him is that declaration borne out; since it is He Himself

Far from being the conviction of a few isolated Christians, Irenæus indicates that the preaching of the Gospel caused such a revolutionary change throughout the world that those who were converted to Christ became "unaccustomed to fighting." They actually changed the use of their weapons of war into agricultural implements. So great was the power of Christ to transform the very nature of sinful men.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (writing about 200 A. D.):⁴¹

storehouse. For He says, "Take no anxious thought for to-morrow,"⁴² meaning that the man who has devoted himself to Christ ought to be sufficient to himself, and servant to himself, and moreover lead a life which provides for each day by itself. For it is not in war, but in peace, that

we are trained. War needs great preparation, and luxury craves profusion; but peace and love, which are quiet souls, require no arms nor excessive preparation. The Word is their sustenance.

The Attitude of Early Christians Toward War

Speaking of the children of God, who listen to His Word and fulfill His will, Clement of Alexandria plainly said that Christians were not trained in war. Language could hardly be more explicit in describing the attitude and conduct of early Christians!

ORIGEN (writing about 250 A. D.): 42, 43, 44

My argument aims at proving the falsehood of the assertion that *certain people who were Egyptian by race revolted against the Egyptians and left Egypt, and came to Palestine where they inhabited the part now called Judaea*. For the Hebrews had their traditional language before they went down to Egypt, and Hebrew letters were different from those of the Egyptians; Moses used them when he wrote the five books which the Jews believe to be sacred.

7. Just as it is false that the Hebrews, being Egyptians, originated from a revolt, it is equally false that others who were Jews revolted at the time of Jesus against the Jewish community and followed Jesus. Celsus and people who think as he does will not be able to show any sign of a revolt. If a revolt had been the cause of the Christians existing as a separate group (and they originated from the Jews for whom it was lawful to take up arms in defence of their families and to serve in the wars), the lawgiver of the Christians would not have forbidden entirely the taking of human life. He taught that it was never right for his disciples to go so far against a man, even if he should be very wicked; for he did not consider it compatible with his inspired legislation to allow the taking of human life in any form at all. Moreover, if Christians had originated from a revolt, they would not have submitted to laws which were so gentle, which caused them to be killed 'as sheep',² and made them unable ever to defend themselves against their persecutors.³ However, a more profound study of this question enables us to say of the people who came out of the land of Egypt, that it would be amazing if the whole people had taken up Hebrew all at once, as though the language had come down from heaven. So also one of their prophets said: 'In their going out of the land of Egypt he heard a language which he did not know.'

8. In this way also we may establish that those who came out of Egypt with Moses were not Egyptians. If they had been Egyptians, their names must have been Egyptian, because in each language names are of the same type as the vernacular. But it is obvious that they were not Egyptians from the fact that the names are Hebrew (for the Bible is full of Hebrew names even of those in Egypt who gave such names to their sons). If so, then clearly the assertion of the Egyptians is false that those who were driven out of Egypt with Moses were Egyptians; and it is

perfectly clear that they were descended from Hebrew stock according to the history recorded by Moses, and that they spoke their own language which they also employed to give names to their sons. Concerning the Christians, on the other hand, we say that they have been taught not to defend themselves against their enemies; and because they have kept the laws which command gentleness and love to man, on this account they have received from God³ that which they could not have succeeded in doing if they had been given the right to make war, even though they may have been quite able to do so. He always fought for them and from time to time stopped the opponents of the Christians and the people who wanted to kill them. For a few, whose number could be easily enumerated, have died occasionally for the sake of the Christian religion by way of reminder to men that when they see a few striving for piety they may become more steadfast and may despise death. But God prevented their whole race from being annihilated because He wanted it to be established and the whole world to be filled by this most pious teaching of salvation. And again, that the weaker men might recover from anxiety about death, God's providence has cared for believers; for by His will alone He has dispersed all the opposition to them, so that kings and local governors and the common people were unable to be too violently inflamed against them. This is my reply to Celsus' assertion that a revolt was the origin of the establishment of the Jews in ancient times, and later of the existence of the Christians.

Here Origen replies to accusations made by the pagan Celsus that Christianity originated from an armed revolt against the Jewish community. In this reply Origen asserts that the first Christians had been taught not to take human life. He clarifies this by showing that they were not permitted to make war against their enemies.

558

ORIGEN AGA

forth, and say to one another, turning to the religion which in the last days has shone forth through Jesus Christ: "Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in them."¹ For the law came forth from the dwellers in Sion, and settled among us as a spiritual law. Moreover, the word of the Lord came forth from that very Jerusalem, that it might be disseminated through all places, and might judge in the midst of the heathen, selecting those whom it sees to be submissive.

The Attitude of Early Christians Toward War

and rejecting² the disobedient, who are many in number. And to those who inquire of us whence we come, or who is our founder,³ we reply that we are come, agreeably to the counsels of Jesus, to "cut down our hostile and insolent 'wordy' " swords into ploughshares, and to convert into pruning-hooks the spears formerly employed in war."⁴ For we no longer take up "sword against nation," nor do we "learn war any more," having become children of peace, for the sake of Jesus, who is our leader, instead of those whom our fathers followed, among whom we were "strangers to the covenant," and having received a law, for which we give thanks to Him that rescued us from the error (of our ways), saying, "Our fathers honoured lying idols, and there is not among them one that causeth it to rain." Our Superintendent, then, and Teacher, having come forth from the Jews, regulates the whole world by the word of His teaching. And having

Here it will be noticed that Origen refers to the "sword into plowshare" figure of the Old Testament and applies it to Christians whom he declared did not learn war any more.

And this we do in obedience to the injunction of the apostle, "I exhort, therefore, that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority;"⁵ and the more any one excels in piety, the more effective help does he render to kings, even more than is given by soldiers, who go forth to fight and slay as many of the enemy as they can. And to those enemies of our faith who require us to bear arms for the commonwealth, and to slay men, we can reply: "Do not those who are priests at certain shrines, and those who attend on certain gods, as you account them, keep their hands free from blood, that they may with hands unstained and free from human blood offer the appointed sacrifices to your gods; and even when war is upon you, you never enlist the priests in the army. If that, then, is a laudable custom, how much more so, that while others are engaged in battle, these too should engage as the priests and ministers of God, keeping their hands pure, and wrestling in prayers to God on behalf of

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

those who are fighting in a righteous cause, and for the king who reigns righteously, that whatever is opposed to those who act righteously may be destroyed!" And as we by our prayers vanquish all demons who stir up war, and lead to the violation of oaths, and disturb the peace, we in this way are much more helpful to the king than those who go into the field to fight for them. And we do take our part in public affairs, when along with righteous prayers we join self-denying exercises and meditations, which teach us to despise pleasures, and not to be led away by them. And none fight better for the king than we do. We do not indeed fight under him, although he require it; but we fight on his behalf, forming a special army — an army of piety — by offering our prayers to God.

Celsus had charged Christians with being unpatriotic. To this Origen replies that, while Christians did refuse to go into the battle field to slay men, they were of more help to the king by their godly lives and intercessory prayers.

LACTANTIUS (writing about 300 A. D.):⁴⁵

CHAP. XX.]

THE DIVINE

as soon as possible. Being imbued with this practice, they have lost their humanity. Therefore they do not spare even the innocent, but practise upon all that which they have learned in the slaughter of the wicked. It is not therefore befitting that those who strive to keep to the path of justice should be companions and sharers in this public homicide. For when God forbids us to kill, He not only prohibits us from open violence, which is not even allowed by the public laws, but He warns us against the commission of those things which are esteemed lawful among men. Thus it will be neither lawful for a just man to engage in warfare, since his warfare is justice itself, nor to accuse any one of a capital charge, because it makes no difference whether you put a man to death by word, or rather by the sword, since it is the act of putting to death itself which is prohibited. Therefore, with regard to this precept of God, there ought to be no exception at all; but that it is always unlawful to put to death a man, whom God willed to be a sacred animal.¹

Lactantius asserted that God had forbidden Christians from killing. He explains that, even if an act were considered lawful in the eyes of men, to be counted just before God one must not engage in it if it violated the will of God. He applies this principle to warfare.

ARNOBIUS (writing about 300 A. D.):⁴⁶

6. Although you allege that those wars which you speak of were excited through hatred of our religion, it would not be difficult to prove, that after the name of Christ was heard in the world, not only were they not increased, but they were even in great measure diminished by the restraining of furious passions. For since we, a numerous band of men as we are, have learned from His teaching and His laws that evil ought not to be requited with evil,^a that it is better to suffer wrong than to inflict it, that we should rather shed our own blood than stain our hands and our conscience with that of another, an ungrateful world is now for a long period enjoying a benefit from Christ, inasmuch as by His means the rage of savage ferocity has been softened, and has begun to withhold hostile hands from the blood of a fellow-creature. But if all without exception, who feel that they are men not in form of body but in power of reason, would lend an ear for a little to His salutary and peaceful rules, and would not, in the pride and arrogance of enlightenment, trust to their own senses rather than to His admonitions, the whole world, having turned the use of steel into more peaceful occupations, would now be living in the most placid tranquillity, and would unite in blessed harmony, maintaining inviolate the sanctity of treaties.

Arnobius exposes the falseness of the charge that wars increased because of Christianity. On the contrary, he explains that wars were actually diminished as the result of peace loving Christians who acted as a restraining force by their compliance with the teaching of Christ. He further observes that if the whole world were to abide by the "peaceful rules" of Jesus all men would enjoy "the most placid tranquillity." We especially note from this quotation of Arnobius' that Christians learned from Jesus not to inflict wrong or stain their hands with the blood of others in carnal warfare.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

Let us now turn our attention to the testimony of unbelievers on the question of whether or not the early Christians engaged in war. We have already seen that Origen's reply to Celsus, the pagan, contained a defense of the Christian position of non-participation in carnal warfare. Thus we have the testimony of Celsus that the Christians in his day refused to serve in the army. He attempted to use this fact to show the detrimental effect that Christianity had upon the nation. Origen's work "Contra Celsum" (Against Celsus) contains Origen's reply to these arguments, which were made in Celsus' "The True Doctrine" (of which no copy exists today). From such statements we learn that the early church was so strongly opposed to war that this became a chief criticism of its enemies.

About 176 A. D. the emperor of Rome, Marcus Aurelius, adds his voice to the mounting evidence which testifies to the early church's refusal to engage in war. We are told that he attempted to bolster his armies by conscripting Christians with threats, only to find that they refused to bear arms because of their allegiance to God.⁴⁷

Historical records also bear out that many early Christians went on record, at the risk of their very lives, as being opposed to armed warfare. A few names have survived to this effect.

Sulpicius Severus relates an incident which occurred about three hundred years after Christ in which a man named Martin answered Julian the apostate with the words, "I am a soldier of Christ, therefore I cannot fight."⁴⁸

About 295 A. D. a young man named Maximilian was brought before the authorities in Africa for refusing induction into the army. Said he, "I cannot serve as a soldier; I cannot do evil; I am a Christian." The strength of conviction and degree of dedication of such persons, even at that late period, is reflected in Maximilian's reply when told that his refusal meant his death, "I shall not perish, but when I have forsaken this world, my soul shall live with Christ my Lord." He was put to death at the age of twenty-one.⁴⁹

Epp tells of an early Christian named Tarachus who, upon becoming a Christian, renounced soldiering with these words, "I have led a military life, and am a Roman. But because I am now a Christian, I have abandoned my

profession as a soldier."⁵⁰

Several renowned historians agree upon the strict stand against war held by the early church. Eusebius' "Ecclesiastical History", written about 324 A. D., tells of a high ranking Roman military officer who became a Christian and then "by his voluntary confession and after nobly enduring bitter scourging succeeded in getting discharged from military service."⁵¹

It was this aversion to military service by the early church that proved to be one cause of encountering persecution at the hands of the Roman government. Philip Schaff takes note of this in his exhaustive work "History of the Christian Church."

"Then, too, the conscientious refusal of the Christians to pay divine honors to the emperor and his statue, and to take part in any idolatrous ceremonies at public festivities, their aversion to the imperial military service...drew upon them the suspicion of hostility to the Caesars and the Roman people, and the unpardonable crime of conspiracy against the state."⁵²

Cadoux tells us that cases of Christians refusing to participate in military warfare were so numerous that they probably played an important part in bringing on the great persecution of the church of 303 A. D.⁵³

Edward Gibbon, in his famous work "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" declares the early Christians were adverse to shedding the blood of their fellow-creatures for any reason. They were thoroughly dedicated to obeying the authorities but were so passive they found themselves unable to take any active part in the violence required by a military defense of the empire.⁵⁴

The Christians were not less adverse to the business than to the pleasures of this world. The defence of our persons and property they knew not how to reconcile with the patient doctrine which enjoined an unlimited forgiveness of past injuries, and commanded them to invite the repetition of fresh insults. Their simplicity was offended by the use of oaths, by the pomp of magistracy, and by the active contention of public life; nor could their humane ignorance be convinced that it was lawful on any occasion to shed the blood of our fellow-creatures, either by the sword of justice or by that of war, even

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

though their criminal or hostile attempts should threaten the peace and safety of the whole community.¹⁰⁰ It was acknowledged that, under a less perfect law, the powers of the Jewish constitution had been exercised, with the approbation of Heaven, by inspired prophets and by anointed kings. The Christians felt and confessed that such institutions might be necessary for the present system of the world, and they cheerfully submitted to the authority of their Pagan governors. But while they inculcated the maxims of passive obedience, they refused to take any active part in the civil administration or the military defence of the empire. Some indulgence might perhaps be allowed to those persons who, before their conversion, were already engaged in such violent and sanguinary occupations;¹⁰¹ but it was impossible that the Christians, without renouncing a more sacred duty, could assume the character of soldiers, of magistrates, or of princes.¹⁰²

We conclude from the consistent pattern of historical evidence, bearing on the attitude of the early church toward war, that the church opposed participation in any form. As apostasy developed, a gradual laxity in this conviction crept in. This led to prominent church leaders speaking out in their writings against entering the army. Finally, as the government became dominant in the ranks of ecclesiastical authority, only a minority remained who held fast to the original position of the early church.

When the church was nearest its fountain-head of doctrinal purity, under the guidance of Holy Spirit inspired apostles, it held firmly to non-participation in armed warfare. This is the position to which every earnest Christian today should adhere as he seeks to follow the teaching and example of Christ and the inspired writings of the New Testament.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER TWELVE

31. C. J. Cadoux, *THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR*, (London: Headley Bros. Publishers, Ltd.: 1919) p. 17.

32. Guy F. Hershberger, *WAR, PEACE AND NON-RESISTANCE*, (Scottsdale, Penn.: Herald Press: 1953) p. 65.

33. Roland H. Bainton, *CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR AND PEACE*, (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press: 1960) p. 67.

The Attitude of Early Christians Toward War

34. Hershberger, *op. cit.*, p. 66.
35. Bainton, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
36. Justin Martyr, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. I, "Dialogue With Trypho," Chapter CX, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) page 176.
37. Justin Martyr, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. I, "The First Apology of Justin," Chapter XXXIX, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 176.
38. Tertullian, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. III, "The Chaplet," Chapter XI, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 99.
39. Tertullian, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. III, "On Idolatry," Chapter XIX, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 73.
40. Irenaeus, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. I, "Irenaeus Against Heresies," Chapter 34, Paragraph 4, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 512.
41. Clement of Alexandria, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. II, "The Instructor," Chapter XII, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 234.
42. Origen, CONTRA CELSUM, translated by Henry Chadwick, Book 3, Paragraphs 7-8, (London: Cambridge at the University Press: 1953) pp. 132-133.
43. Origen, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. IV, "Origen Against Celsus," Chapter XXXIII, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 558.
44. Origen, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. IV, "Origen Against Celsus," Chapter LXXIII, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 668.
45. Lactantius, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. VII, "The Divine Institutes," Chapter XX, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) page 187.
46. Arnobius, THE ANTE-NICENE FATHERS, Vol. VI, "Arnobius Against the Heathen," Book I, Chapter VI, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1956) p. 415.
47. Robert Barclay, AN APOLOGY FOR THE TRUE CHRISTIAN DIVINITY, Philadelphia: Friends' Book Store: no date) p. 521.
48. Barclay, *op. cit.*, p. 521.
49. J. A. Toews, TRUE NONRESISTANCE THROUGH CHRIST, (Winnipeg, Canada: The Christian Press: 1955) p. 56.
50. Theodore Epp, SHOULD GOD'S PEOPLE PARTAKE OF WAR? (Inman, Kansas: Salem Publishing House: Third Edition: 1949) p. 31.
51. G. J. Heering, THE FALL OF CHRISTIANITY, as quoted by Hershberger, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
52. Philip Schaff, HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Vol. II, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons: 1887) p. 43.
53. C. J. Cadoux, THE EARLY CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE TO WAR, (London: Headley Bros. Publishers, Ltd.: 1919) pp. 150-151.
54. Edward Gibbon, THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, Vol. I, Chapter 15, ("Great Books of the Western World": Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.: Vol. 40, page 193).

PART II

CHAPTER ONE

“What if Everyone Felt That Way About It?”

This is usually the first objection raised by those who disagree with the position that a Christian should not engage in war. It is not a new objection for we saw that it was used by Celsus, the pagan philosopher, in his work “The True Doctrine,” written about 176 A. D., in an attempt to refute the entire religion of Christ. As Celsus stated it, the consequences of refusing to participate in war were too terrible to even consider taking such a position. He said that barbarians would overrun the earth and that every race, all true wisdom and even the Christian religion itself would be obliterated. Objectors to Christians not participating in war today are saying the same things: “The Communists will take over the whole world and destroy our cities, our families, our homes, our churches and everything!” Needless to say this would be a great tragedy, but let us consider a reply to this seemingly unanswerable objection.

First of all, it will never happen that everyone will take the position of a Christian who declines military service. After giving the parable of the slighted invitation to the marriage feast Jesus closes with the statement, “Many are called, but few chosen” (Matthew 22:14). In His sermon on the mount Jesus declared, “For narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life, and few are they that find it” (Matthew 7:14). From these two passages we can see that the Bible teaches only a few will be saved. The number who become Christians throughout the world has always been a minority of the total population. Thus, in any nation, those who hold as a Christian principle non-participation in war, would be such a small number that it could never affect the military security of that nation. Therefore, to raise the objection,

“What If Everyone Felt that Way About It?”

“What if everyone believed like that?” is to suggest a hypothetical situation that does not harmonize with Scriptural teaching, and so could not be an actual threat to any nation.

As a second reply, let us allow the possibility that everyone in America did oppose participating in war as a genuine Christian conviction. This would mean that 200,000,000 persons in our country would be thoroughly converted and completely dedicated children of God. There would be no one left in the United States to convert. But long before this condition ever came about the “missionary” zeal of all these Christians would have been so great that they would have sent and financed preachers and Christian workers into all the rest of the world. The impact of the Gospel would have been felt in every nation on the face of the earth and among every “barbarian” tribe. The influence of the saving power of Christ would have so permeated the earth that there would be no country left where lust and covetousness (the causes of war according to James 4:1-2) would rule strong enough to bring about war. Thus if every person in America felt that he could not participate in war because of being a Christian, the rest of the world would be so affected by this that war would cease to be a possibility.

In the third place, suppose that all 200,000,000 Americans were Christians and thereby could not conscientiously partake of war. Would the logical conclusion follow that America would be taken over by the Communists or some other atheistic nation? Could not God Almighty, in answer to the fervent prayers of 200,000,000 of His saints, deliver them from the hands of their enemy? Would He not be very likely to do so especially if they were devoutly following His will as revealed in the Scriptures? Indeed, we are not left entirely to guess about God’s attitude in such matters for He once spoke like this to His people Israel: “If my people, who are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land” (II Chronicles 7:14). We are not saying that God will spare His people from destruction, but He could in answer to their prayers! At any rate this vast multitude would have at least as much reason to expect God’s deliverance under such circumstances as your objector would

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

have to expect the enemy's victory. It is a question of who has the greater power, God or Satan. He has to prove that Satan does in order to insist that God could not answer a prayer for deliverance by 200,000,000 American Christians.

In the fourth place, let us suppose, for argument's sake, that "everyone felt like that" about war and so the Communists swarmed in upon us and took over the land. With 200,000,000 Christians in America, would the Communists destroy the home, the family and the Christian religion? Remember, the church in its infancy not only survived but spread rapidly under the crushing yoke of the pagan, totalitarian Roman empire, which regarded Christianity as an illegal religion. In its attempt to stamp out the church thousands of Christians were put to torturous deaths in the arena. But did all this obliterate the influence of home, family and church? Recently, in the tiny remnant of the once mighty Roman empire, the country of Italy, it was found that juvenile delinquency was at the lowest rate of any western nation and this was attributed to the dominating role of the father as head of the Italian home.⁵⁵ In this same country it was found recently that 90% of the college girls maintained their sexual purity before marriage over against only 65% in Canada, 57% in the U. S., 46% in Norway, 40% in Germany and 37% in England.⁵⁶ Such has been the influence of Christian principles upon the Roman empire over the past 2,000 years. Our contention is that the Christian witness of 200,000,000 Christians here in America would be so overwhelming to the Communists that it would eventually bring about their downfall. We are told that one Christian martyr, dying in flames at the stake under the cruel Roman empire, led to dozens embracing the faith as they witnessed his self-sacrificing courage.

Finally, "if everyone felt that way about it," and America were taken over by a foreign power and all the Christians put to death, what would that mean? From a purely physical standpoint it would certainly be a tragedy. But from the spiritual it would simply mean that these saints had arrived at the glorious time when their eternal reward was realized. And if they had given up their lives in doing what was right in God's sight, what other course would have been better to choose? Jesus said, "And he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it" (Matthew

"What If Everyone Felt that Way About It?"

10:39). Remember, if everyone in America felt the same way about refusing to participate in war, there would be none to criticize them for this position and none who dissented from it to suffer the consequences. Most people who raise the objection under discussion here never stop to analyze all that is involved. If they did, they would likely never use such a weak argument.

By the way, "if everyone felt that way" about not partaking in war, your objector would be included and thus he would not be raising the objection in the first place.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER ONE

55. Judge Sam S. Leibowitz, "Nine Words That Can Stop Juvenile Delinquency," *THE READER'S DIGEST*, March, 1958, p. 105.

56. *TIME MAGAZINE*, August 16, 1968, p. 52.

CHAPTER TWO

“Aren’t Christians Supposed to Give Their Lives for One Another?”

This objection, as most of them aimed at the Christian position of not participating in war, is designed to strike at the virtue of the person who holds such a position. He is made to appear a worse Christian instead of a better one because of his conviction against war. It is insinuated that he is either a coward or selfish. Then, if the objector is better acquainted with the Bible, he will cite the passage in I John 3:16: “Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren.” From this he suggests that a Christian should be willing to go to war and fight for his country, his neighbors and his loved ones. If he must die in the process this is only the supreme demonstration of his genuine love. The final conclusion is that a professing Christian who refuses to engage in carnal warfare is guilty of the gross neglect of a vital test of his Christianity at least, or pure hypocrisy at worst.

Although this objection is often made with delighted finality, there is no real strength to it whatever. While Christians should love one another enough to forfeit their lives for one another, if the need arises, this cannot be done if it involves violating the will of God in another matter. Simply stated, it cannot be right to save a life by taking a life. War requires taking the lives of one’s enemies in order to preserve the lives of his friends.

The very passage of Scripture on which this objection is based does not uphold this view. We were the enemies of Christ when, because of His love, He laid down His life for us (Romans 5:6-10). Furthermore, He not only refused to show ill will toward those who sought His

life but even forbade His followers to do any harm to them.

The principle involved in this objection would permit a Christian to become something of a “Robin Hood” and steal from his enemies in order to minister to the needs of his friends.

Also recall that Jesus instructed His disciples to remain neutral during the seige and fall of Jerusalem rather than to engage in a life and death struggle with the Roman armies to preserve the lives of their fellow inhabitants of the city.

If the element of prime importance is for the Christian to give his life to preserve the lives of others, without regard to justice or righteousness, one would be justified in obstructing the due process of law as it carried out the execution of a criminal. He could wage a gun battle with prison authorities, kill several guards, and finally be shot to death himself, as he sought to free the condemned criminal from execution in the electric chair. If this pictures a total disregard for law and order, we answer, so does war. If this poses an absurd parallel, we suggest that justifying killing in war as an act of love for others is equally absurd.

CHAPTER THREE

“It Would Be a Stumbling Block not to Fight for Our “Country in War

This objection looks at the problem from the standpoint of the person outside the church. Since he cannot appreciate the reasons why a Christian refuses to fight and kill in war, he looks down upon Christianity as weak and foolish and therefore cannot be won to Christ. Since Christian leaders are to have a good testimony from those outside of the church (I Timothy 3:7) and since Christians are to give no occasion of stumbling either to unsaved people or fellow-Christians (I Corinthians 10:32-33), they should enter the military service, take up arms and wage war, fully participating in all of the cruelty and bloodshed this involves. This is the argument of the objector.

There is no question about the need for Christians to set the best possible example of honesty, virtue and sincerity before the world. Without these, people will be repulsed by Christianity rather than attracted to it. But is there a limit beyond which the Christian dare not go in his desire to “please all men in all things?” Certainly no one would suggest that a Christian is obligated to become a drunkard, dope addict or immoral person in order to avoid being a stumbling-block before such persons who practice these things. Everyone would agree that there has to be a limit. To the Christian this limit is the teaching of the Bible. He cannot stop short of its requirements nor go beyond them, regardless of the effect it may have on the people of the world. Contrary to the tenets of the “new morality” the Bible teaches there are such absolutes as right and wrong. And despite the current emphasis upon “situation ethics” the Bible leaves no loop-holes for practicing certain ethics only in particular situations.

Now back to the objection. If the Bible teaches that

a Christian should not participate in war, and we feel this has been clearly shown in Part I, then a Christian must refrain from such participation regardless of the consequences. He may be misunderstood, ridiculed, persecuted, ostracized and discriminated against for his belief and conduct. But Jesus predicted that His disciples would be hated, reproached and cast out as evil for His sake (Luke 6:22) and then went on to warn them, "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you" (Luke 6:26). The very nature of the Christian position makes it impossible to reconcile it with that of the world. They are simply incompatible.

So when the objection is raised that our refusal to enter carnal combat will prove a stumbling block to the world, we must reply that so will a number of other convictions. Rather than to forsake a Bible-based position the Christian's responsibility is to live such a life of consistent dedication to the principles of love, truth, purity and self-sacrificial service to others that the world will be forced to acknowledge his genuine sincerity at least. And if the world doesn't? Then right shall still always be right!

CHAPTER FOUR

“Didn’t Jesus Use Violence in Driving the Moneychangers Out of the Temple?”

The force of this objection lies in what it implies. If Jesus resorted to the use of violence, in whipping the moneychangers who were using the Temple for mercenary purposes, would that not set a precedent for Christians to follow in using violence and brutality in war? This objection appeals to the example of Jesus as a basis for acceptable Christian conduct. The argument is, “If it were right for Jesus to whip, it is right for Christians to war.”

In analyzing this objection it will be necessary for us to have the text of this incident before us. The passage is found in John 2:13-17, and reads as follows:

“And the passover of the Jews was at hand, and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. And he found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: and he made a scourge of cords, and cast all out of the temple, both the sheep and oxen; and he poured out the changers’ money, and overthrew their tables; and to them that sold the doves he said, Take these things hence; make not my Father’s house a house of merchandise. His disciples remembered that it was written, Zeal for thy house shall eat me up.”

—American Standard Version of 1901

This objection is thought by some to have much weight in favor of a Christian going to war because it makes an appeal to a specific passage of Scripture supposedly sanctioning the principle of war. Let us examine it carefully to see if this is so.

First of all, did Jesus actually use the scourge or whip of cords to literally beat with at all? Some consider

the reference to a scourge as “an emblem of authority rather than as a weapon of offence.”⁵⁷ In his commentary on the Gospel of John, we find this comment from B. W. Johnson regarding this scourge of cords, “Chosen more as a symbol...probably not laid in violence upon anyone.... The traffickers fled before his glance; not in terror of his scourge.”⁵⁸ The text actually tells us that He “made a scourge” but does not state specifically that He used it. After all, the very piercing gaze of Jesus, together with His authoritative voice, would be sufficient to accomplish His purpose.

But, allowing that He did use the scourge of cords in a literal way, let us consider upon whom Jesus inflicted its lashes. Since a whip or rod is more naturally used upon animals than upon men to prod their movement, we may rightly conclude that Jesus used the scourge upon the sheep and oxen. Macgregor tells us that “a correct rendering of the Greek makes it clear that the whip was used only on the animals” if it were literally used at all.⁵⁹ With this Rutenber also agrees.⁶⁰

A number of New Testament translations render John 2:15 in such a way as to indicate that, in driving “all” from the temple, Jesus actually drove only the sheep and the oxen. You will notice in the American Standard Version quoted in its entirety at the beginning of this chapter that “all” is further clarified as meaning “both the sheep and the oxen.” Among the translations which bear out this same meaning are the English Revised of 1881, Weymouth, Rotherham, Berry’s Interlinear, Amplified, Robert Shank (Jesus, His Story), Moulton’s “The Modern Reader’s Bible,” American Bible Union, Panin’s Numeric and others. A few translations are even more explicit in pointing out that it was the animals that were cast out with the scourge and not the men. Goodspeed says, “and drove them all, sheep and cattle, out of the temple.” The Living New Testament makes the distinction clear in its paraphrase: “Jesus made a whip from some ropes and chased them all out, and drove out the sheep and oxen.” Finally, Today’s English Version says, “He drove all the animals out of the temple, both the sheep and the cattle.”

Among other noted commentators who assert that the scourge was used on the animals and not the men are J. W. McGarvey and Albert Barnes. So this passage gives no example of inflicting physical harm upon evil doers as some would like it to.

There is some evidence, also, that Jesus used no violence at all on this occasion. The words "cast out" in the text are used elsewhere in the New Testament where no violent action is involved whatever. The same Greek word for "cast out" is used in Matthew 9:38 where Jesus refers to "sending forth" laborers into the harvest. It is used again in Mark 1:12 where the Spirit "driveth him (Jesus) forth into the wilderness." From these instances it becomes clear that the language used does not demand that we understand Jesus to have used violence necessarily on this occasion.

Had Jesus used violence, thrashing men with a whip, why did they not turn upon Him and subdue Him? He was certainly far outnumbered. If it be replied that He demonstrated a divine authority that prevented the money-changers from retaliating, we say that such authority could have been exerted even without the use of a scourge. Consider the incidents at the brink of the cliff in Nazareth where Jesus passed through the angry mob untouched (Luke 4:28-30) and the case in Gethsemane when the armed band of soldiers "went backward, and fell to the ground" when Jesus identified Himself to them (John 18:6).

We might also observe that, had Jesus cast out the men along with the animals, who would have been left to carry the bird cages out of the temple? After the reference to Jesus casting "all" out of the temple, He addresses the dove sellers and commands them to "Take these things hence," that is, remove the bird crates (or possibly other objects connected with the business). In any event, men were still in the temple after Jesus drove the animals out.

Thus is dissolved a seemingly choice example of physical brutality upon humans by the Lord Jesus Christ. And with it goes a primary "proof text" for justifying Christians participating in war.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER FOUR

- 57. C. G. H. Macgregor, **THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS OF PACIFISM**, (Nyack, New York: Fellowship Publications: 1960) p. 17.
- 58. B. W. Johnson, **THE NEW TESTAMENT COMMENTARY**, Vol. III, **JOHN**, (Dallas, Texas: Eugene S. Smith, Publisher; c. 1886, Reprint edition, no date) p. 51.
- 59. C. G. H. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
- 60. Culbert G. Rutenber, **THE DAGGER AND THE CROSS**, (Nyack, New York: Fellowship Publications: 1958) p. 41.

CHAPTER FIVE

“Wasn’t Cornelius the Centurion a Soldier?”

This objection is intended to imply that, since Cornelius who was a soldier in command of one hundred men became a Christian, this is a New Testament endorsement of Christians going to war. The account of this man’s conversion may be found in Acts, the tenth chapter. But one very vital element of this case is totally ignored by those who try to use it as a basis for justifying military service for Christians. This is an example only of a soldier becoming a Christian and not of a Christian becoming a soldier. There is no example in the New Testament of a Christian becoming a soldier. We are all in agreement that all soldiers may and should become Christians and we have a New Testament example of this occurring. The question is over whether a Christian may or should become a soldier and of such an event we have no Scriptural precedent. If we concluded our consideration of the subject at this point we have already established the inherent weakness of this objection. But there is more that can be said about it.

This objection builds its entire case upon the assumption that Cornelius remained in the army and continued the work of soldiering following his conversion. Those who are not opposed to Christians participating in war freely admit that they assume both Cornelius and the jailor (Acts 16:23-34) remained in their respective positions after their conversions.⁶¹

Now since the account of Cornelius closes with his baptism we do not have any subsequent history of the man to inform us of his place of residence or occupation thereafter. If we are to give any further thought to the man following his conversion we, too, must make assumptions regarding his future. However, we do so only be-

cause the objector first brings Cornelius into the picture. In reality, all we are obligated to do with this objection is to test the assumption that Cornelius remained a soldier. Is it the safest and most logical one in view of the general tenor of Scriptural teaching found throughout the New Testament?

First of all, let us raise the question as to whether others mentioned in the New Testament continued in their particular occupations or professions following their encounter with the Christ. Both Zachaeus (Luke 19:1-9) and Matthew (Matthew 9:9-13) had been publicans or tax collectors before they met Jesus. This was equivalent to being a "sinner" (Luke 19:7) due to the corrupt nature of the business. Zachaeus admits to extortion and, as evidence of repentance, promises to restore his ill-gotten gains (Luke 19:8). The question arises, did Zachaeus remain a publican after salvation came to his house that day? If cheating people was an inherent part of the job of tax collecting in order to make a living, then surely he eventually resigned from his post. If not, then possibly he stayed on. However, the stigma attached to being a publican was so pronounced that it seems hardly probable that his new outlook would have permitted him to continue at this work.

Next, consider the several references to prostitutes becoming followers of the Lord. Jesus commends the publicans and harlots for believing the message of John the Baptist (Matthew 21:31-32). He further points out that they would be more receptive to the message of the kingdom than the self-righteous Jews. We ask the question, did these prostitutes, upon accepting the message of John and no doubt that of the apostles later, forsake their profession? While prostitution was certainly immoral according to the Mosaic law, it was neither immoral nor illegal according to the prevailing Roman law. Tacitus even tells us that there was an official register of prostitutes kept by the Roman authorities.⁶² So the practice of harlotry prevailed in the Roman empire with the sanction of the government, but that did not make it right in God's eyes. Every prostitute who came to believe in Christ unquestionably repented of her immorality and necessarily forsook her profession.

If then a publican and a harlot left their occupations when becoming followers of the Lord, because to con-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

tinue would have involved sin, would not we have the right to safely assume that a soldier did likewise? While we are not specifically told that Cornelius resigned from military duty, neither are we specifically told that the publicans or harlots changed occupations. But our assumption that they did is safe because of the nature of their work requiring conduct totally unfitting of a disciple of Christ.

This leads us to the advice given to some soldiers by John the Baptist (Luke 3:14). When they came to him for baptism they requested to know what they were to do as an expression of the repentance John had demanded in his preaching. John's reply was, "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages" (KJV). Those who argue in favor of warring by Christians point out from this incident that John did not tell those soldiers to stop being soldiers. From this they deduce that it is legitimate for a Christian to remain in the armed forces and participate in war. But let us notice the restriction John placed upon these men. They were not to engage in any violence toward people. Norlie's translation puts it this way: "Don't mistreat anyone." The Amplified says, "Never demand or enforce by terrifying people." The Living Oracles translation expresses the idea by saying, "Injure no man, either by violence or false accusation." Now, how could a man continue as a part of an armed military fighting unit without being violent, mistreating, terrifying and injuring people? Instead of John's advice endorsing the type of service required by a soldier, it would actually lead to a man dissolving his relationship with the army. John's advice did not flatly demand that the soldiers resign from military duty but it required such principles to be observed that would make continuance in the army virtually impossible. The Bible is primarily concerned with internal motives and attitudes which, when they are in harmony with divine principles, will govern external relationships.

Finally, if Cornelius remained in the army, why do we find no evidence whatever for the first 150 years of the church's existence that Christians were in the army?⁶³ Would not the example of the first Gentile convert, led to Christ by the apostle Peter himself, have been sufficient proof that military service was acceptable to God? Would not his action in remaining in the army have become so

well known that later writers would have used him as prime evidence that Christians should engage in war? Surely the conduct of a man personally acquainted with an apostle would have held great sway in the early church. But if he remained in the military the entire early church, according to the most competent authorities in such matters, acted contrary to his example by refusing to serve in the army.

Thus, Cornelius' example would best be left unmentioned by those who advocate serving in the armed forces for, if anything, it comes nearer refuting their objection than substantiating it.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER FIVE

61. Allen Isbell, **WAR AND CONSCIENCE**, (Abilene, Texas: Biblical Research Press: 1966) p. 54.
62. Otto Kiefer, **SEXUAL LIFE IN ANCIENT ROME**, (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc.: 1953) pp. 60-63.
63. Roland H. Bainton, **CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR AND PEACE**, (New York: Abingdon Press: 1960) p. 67.

CHAPTER SIX

“Doesn’t Being in Subjection to the Higher Powers Require Going to War?”

The passage of Scripture on which this objection is based is found in Romans 13:1-7. Verse one of this passage reads as follows: “Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God: and the powers that be are ordained of God.” Verse five says, “Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection....”

Another passage that bears on this subject is I Peter 2:13-17. Verses thirteen and fourteen read, “Be subject to every ordinance for the Lord’s sake: whether to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as sent by him....”

A third verse that carries a similar thought is Titus 3:1 which says, “Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient....”

The above Scriptures clearly teach that Christians have the responsibility of obeying the laws of their government. The “higher powers” of Romans 13:1 obviously refers to the civil authorities of a duly constituted government. Such authorities are said to be sanctioned by God and the Christian is to submit to their oversight. The I Peter 2:13 passage expressly requires compliance with “every ordinance” passed by those in authority, such as “kings” or “governors.” The Titus 3:1 verse identifies “in subjection” as meaning “be obedient” to the rulers and authorities. From this it can be seen that Christians must be law-abiding citizens. They must be conscientious in observing all of the laws of the land. They must conform to federal, state and local ordinances. They must honestly comply with the smallest hunting and traffic restrictions as well as with statutes prohibiting bank robbery, kidnapping and murder. Although “civil disobedience” is openly practiced in the name of religion, this does not excuse it from being blatant disregard for law and thorough-

“Doesn't Being in Subjection ... Require Going to War?”

ly unChristian. The importance of this point cannot be overemphasized in this “do-as-you-please,” rebellious generation.

The objection under consideration therefore, is based upon the assumption that the person who refuses to engage in warfare claims, at the same time, to be a respectable citizen who is willing to obey the laws of the land. The argument goes something like this: “You claim to be a Christian. The Bible says that Christians are to obey the laws of the government. If we are at war and the government passes laws requiring men to serve in the armed forces, you are obligated to go. By refusing to go to war you prove that you are not living up to your profession.” How may the Christian answer this charge?

Unfortunately, this objection is based upon ignorance of the very basis of the argument, namely, the law of the land. It is only ASSUMED that the Christian who refuses to enter the armed forces is breaking a law when the truth is, **HE IS BREAKING NO LAW AT ALL!**

This false assumption is very widespread. Nearly every work the author has consulted which advocates that Christians may engage in war either specifically states that the Christian must obey the government and go to war or strongly insinuates this. An article in “The Christian Standard” carried the following statement: “As a Christian, I am duty bound to answer the call of my government.... To resist the call of your government to war...means to resist God.”⁶⁴

Notice how this false assumption that the laws of the United States require Christians to go to war is frequently based upon the Romans 13 and I Peter 2 passages cited above: “Paul says, ‘Every soul;’ Peter says, ‘Every ordinance.’ Yes, a Christian should bear arms in obedience to the commands of the government...”⁶⁵ You will notice that this author jumps from the Scriptures which require obedience to “every ordinance” to the assumption that the government requires “every soul” to go to war. Such ignorance as to just what the government requires is indeed unfortunate. Especially when it is made as a major thrust in the argument designed to induce Christians to participate in armed warfare with carnal weapons.

Let us see what the United States government does require in the way of laws regulating military service. In 1962 a survey was published in which an analysis of laws

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

regarding military service of all the countries of the world (from which information could be obtained) was presented in graphic form.⁶⁶ Thirty-two nations were found to have no laws requiring military service of any kind. Of the remaining fifty-two nations surveyed, who did have laws requiring certain individuals to serve in the military forces, eleven nations have special provisions for those who find themselves unable to participate in war because of religious convictions. One of these eleven countries is the United States of America. We are thankful that our country is pleased to recognize the position of a Christian whose Bible-based convictions make it impossible for him to participate in war. This recognition is in the form of laws which exempt those from becoming a part of the armed forces whose beliefs are opposed to warring. The exact wording of the United States Universal Military Training and Service Act as amended by the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 reads as follows: "Section 6(j) Conscientious Objectors. Nothing contained in this title shall be construed to require any person to be subject to combatant training and service in the armed forces of the United States who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form."⁶⁷

This is the law of the land. This simply means that no Christian is required by the United States government to go to war and kill. Of course, proper forms must be filled out and complete information must be furnished to substantiate one's claim. Where evidence is lacking or the Selective Service Board has reason to doubt the accuracy of the information provided or the sincerity of the applicant, some delay and even occasionally a rejection in granting the deferment occurs. This carefulness on the part of the officials is to be commended as it ferrets out the insincere "draft dodger." But the law is on the side of the consecrated Christian and he may claim this exemption just as one claims exemption from military service on other grounds such as civilian employment, agricultural occupations, students, ministers, or physical disability.

In place of military service the Christian who is conscientiously opposed to "participation in war in any form" is assigned to "civilian work contributing to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest"

"Doesn't Being in Subjection ... Require Going to War?"

according to section 4(b) of the above mentioned law.

Thus the objection that the Christian who refuses to participate in military warfare is disregarding Bible teaching on obedience to governmental authority is entirely unfounded. A Christian can be in subjection to the higher powers and still not go to war.

But there is another element to be considered. What if the United States government DID NOT have laws permitting Christians to be exempt from the service? Or what about the Christians who live in countries where no provision is made for deferment from the army on religious grounds? This would pose the problem of two authorities to which the Christian is obligated to be in subjection. James 4:7 says, "Be subject therefore unto God" while I Peter 2:13 says, "Be subject to every ordinance of man." What if God says not to kill and the government says to kill? Obviously the Christian has a choice to make. Which authority should he obey?

This same problem arises in the parent-child relationship. Ephesians 6:1 makes it essential for children to obey their parents. But what would a Christian young person do if he had an ungodly parent who insisted that he lie or steal while the Bible forbids both of these? We are back to the same dilemma. To whom does a Christian owe primary allegiance where conflicting principles are concerned?

Happily, we are not left to our conjecture, for the Bible gives the clear answer. When the Jewish council in Jerusalem, which had authority to imprison, strictly charged the apostles to discontinue their Gospel preaching, the apostles replied, "We must obey God rather than men" (Acts 5:29). Here we have a clear-cut case of conflicting commands. God had commissioned the apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. This Jewish council had charged them "not to teach in this name." If they disobeyed God they would have to answer to Him and suffer eternal consequences. If they disobeyed the council they would be subject to imprisonment. Which authority were they to consider the highest, that of God or men? The answer is obvious.

This same principle holds true in regard to a government requiring a Christian to go to war and kill while God forbids him from doing this. The Christian must obey God and refuse to engage in war because his first allegi-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

ance is to Almighty God. It is with regret that he declines military service but he has no other choice. He must obey God rather than men. If this involves punishment by the government this would be no more than countless martyrs suffered at the hands of the Roman government in the early days of the church. Any Christian who would place greater care in doing the will of men, even though the men may be authorized to rule over him, than he does in doing the will of God has a misplaced first love. To the Christian, God must come before even members of his own household (Matthew 10:34-39). Jesus taught that his disciples were to seek the kingdom of God first (Matthew 6:33). If service in the kingdoms of men calls for warring and service in the kingdom of God forbids this, the Christian must seek that which is required by God's kingdom first and foremost.

An Old Testament example of this may be seen in the conduct of Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego and Daniel. The first three were required by Nebuchadnezzar, the absolute monarch of Babylon, to fall down and worship a golden image at a given signal, but they refused. Here is a case of the government commanding one thing and God another. These men chose to obey God rather than men (read Daniel 3). In Daniel's case a signed ordinance forbade anyone from praying to any other god than the king for one month. Daniel refused to abide by this government "interdict" and continued praying to the true God (read Daniel 6). In all four cases the men willingly submitted to the punishment brought on by their disobedience to government decrees. In choosing to put God first they were blessed and delivered.

The principle of obedience to God having priority over obedience to one's government is recognized even by the United States Selective Service System. In their special form for conscientious objectors (SSS Form No. 150) the following statement appears under Series II.-Religious Training and Belief: "2. Describe the nature of your belief which is the basis of your claim made in Series I above, and state whether or not your belief in a Supreme Being involves duties which to you are superior to those arising from any human relation." This statement allows for the possibility of a person considering obedience to God of greater importance than complying with a government regulation which he feels is opposed to God's

"Doesn't Being in Subjection ... Require Going to War?"

will. This is the exact situation with a Christian. If he lives under a government which requires military service and does not make provisions for exemption on religious grounds, the Christian must refuse service in their armed forces. His duty to God is superior to his duty to any human being.

Thus the objection based upon subjection to higher powers becomes invalid when viewed in the light of subjection to the Highest Power.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER SIX

64. Buel B. Buzzard, "What the Bible Teaches About War," THE CHRISTIAN STANDARD (Cincinnati, Ohio: Vol. XCVII, No. 45, November 10, 1962) p. 714.
65. Robert L. Moyer, THE CHRISTIAN AND WAR, (Wheaton, Illinois: Sword of the Lord Publishers: 1946) p. 18.
66. THE WAR RESISTER, (Enfield, Middlesex, England: War Resisters International: 1st Quarter, 1962, No. 94.) pp. 5-11.
67. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CLASSIFICATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS, (Washington, D. C.: National Service Board for Religious Objectors: Rev. ed. 1967) p. 1.

CHAPTER SEVEN

“Doesn’t Paying Taxes Assist in Carrying On War?”

This objection is aimed at trying to make the position of non-participation in war an inconsistent one. The argument goes something like this: “You pay taxes that go to support war. What’s the difference between that and serving in the armed forces? In one case you are supporting war with your money and in the other with your time.” As you can see this presents an apparent dilemma. Everyone wants to be consistent in his religious views if he is conscientious at all. To suggest inconsistency can be most upsetting to one’s convictions, especially if he has not met with the objection before. Here are a few suggestions for making a reply.

Christians are responsible for their motives and actions but not for any improper use to which their motives and actions may be put. We are to do good to all men and assist the needy (Galatians 6:10 and James 1:27) but, if such persons use our help to some evil end we cannot be held accountable for their actions. If our motive is to help the needy and our action is that of providing for a legitimate need, we have fulfilled our Christian commitment. We cannot be held liable for all the corruption that might stem from our properly motivated actions which lie beyond our ability to govern or regulate.

Now consider how this relates to war and taxes. We know that every activity which contributes to a war effort is designed to bring the enemy nation to defeat. We know that this effort will involve inflicting violent death upon both the citizens and soldiers of the enemy nation. The object of war is to induce the surrender of the enemy by means of reducing his fighting force to a point which would threaten the complete annihilation of his nation’s population if he refuses to give up. So the extinguishing

“Doesn't Paying Taxes Assist in Carrying On War?”

of human life is the primary objective of war, while the restoration of a peaceful condition, on the terms of the victor, becomes the secondary goal.

Needless to say, the paying of taxes has no such design as that of financing wanton destruction. Its purpose is to provide for the needs of an orderly government. On a local and state level the paying of taxes would never be put to the uses of war. Only on a national level, and then only during war time, would tax money be used for war. And even then, much of the taxes collected by the federal government is still used for roads, parks, conservation, schools, courts, natural resources, etc., etc.

To put it simply: Every effort put forth by a Christian in the military service goes directly toward the all-out goal of taking the lives of as many of the enemy as possible. On the other hand, most of the dollars paid by Christians as taxes go directly toward a host of legitimate uses, many of which the Christian could heartily commend. So there is a vast difference between going to war and paying taxes, and fairness demands that this difference be recognized. When it is, the weakness of this objection becomes obvious.

But there is an even weightier reply to this objection that paying taxes assists the war effort. To all Bible loving Christians this reply should settle the argument based on paying taxes. The Bible clearly teaches that Christians are required to pay taxes, but it does not teach that Christians are required to go to war. The Pharisees once devised a scheme whereby they hoped to trap Jesus into advocating resistance to the Roman occupation forces or advocating that the Jews submit to this totalitarian regime. In either case they hoped to destroy His influence. So they asked Him, “Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?” (Matthew 22:17). In other words, should a person pay his taxes? Jesus said yes! After requesting that a coin be produced, Jesus pointed out the reproduction of Caesar's profile and name on it. We are told that these were placed there as indications that the tokens of monetary exchange of the empire belonged to the emperor himself.⁶⁸ Jesus' reply was wisely worded but unmistakable in its meaning. “Render therefore unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's” (Matthew 22:21). Pay the taxes required by your government and obey the commandments of God. No-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

thing could be plainer. Jesus here settles the tax question once and for all. He shows by His reply that paying taxes was not contrary to the will of God.

But what if some of that tax money went to support war? Although the particular tax here referred to appears to be a type of poll tax⁶⁹, certainly revenues paid by subjects of the Roman government were used for other purposes, including wars of aggression. In addition, tax money paid to the Roman government also went to promote pagan idolatry, drunken orgies and many other sinful practices. Regardless of this, Jesus still said to pay taxes to Tiberius Caesar, the reigning emperor.

Thus Jesus set forth the guiding principle of submission to governmental authority in the matter of taxes, regardless of the use made of the money so collected. The tax money of a Christian in Canada would go to the support of education in some places where religious instruction is given glorifying the Catholic Church. Here in America tax money is used for purchasing textbooks that teach the God-denying doctrine of evolution. Also, tax money is used to pay the salaries of teachers who teach and sanction dancing which prepares children for susceptibility to sex sins later on in life. Despite all of this the Christian is required to be in subjection to the higher powers which includes rendering "tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom is due" (Romans 13:1-7). He must pay his taxes even if a portion of it goes to support such things that he, himself, would not practice or condone.

In the case of taxes we have Scriptural authorization to pay; in the case of war we do not have Scriptural authorization to kill. While this may not fully satisfy the objector, it must be admitted that these are sound Bible principles.

NOTES FROM CHAPTER SEVEN

68. G. H. C. Macgregor, *THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS OF PACIFISM*, (Nyack, New York: Fellowship Publications: 1960) p. 82.

69. Merrill C. Tenney, *NEW TESTAMENT TIMES*, (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.: 1965) p. 152.

CHAPTER EIGHT

“But Killing in War Is Done as an Agent of the Government, not as a Personal Act”

Here is an objection which may take on various forms. The argument may emphasize that since one is a member of society or the community at large his responsibilities must be met to that society. If the community is at war he must participate for he cannot escape being a citizen of some nation.

Some point out that a Christian has obligations to his country as well as obligations to God. They suggest that a Christian may participate in war and even kill for the good of his country but may not commit such acts for his own personal welfare. Those who advocate this position interpret the Bible passages that deal with a Christian and his enemies as referring only to personal enemies. If someone is the enemy of the nation, then it is admissible to join hands with your fellow citizens and destroy that enemy, without incurring any disfavor from God for such an action.

This may be termed “collective action.” Because every human being is part of a nation, country, tribe or society he is bound by this association to participate in every activity deemed wise or necessary by that nation. If a personal moral issue is involved or if the community action has religious or spiritual implications a person is not to consider them because he cannot possibly be held accountable since he is acting merely as part of a collective group whose responsibility is to carry out the decisions of those in charge. The nation decides who is the enemy, how he is to be dealt with and when and where such treatment is to be inflicted. According to this argument the Christian has no other recourse than to comply with such decisions. He has no other Source of authority or allegiance to which he is obligated which might affect his con-

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

duct. He can do no personal wrong because he is not acting personally. When involved in such collective actions of his nation he is in a virtual state of immunity from responsibility to God. If, in the nation's view, its best interests were served by killing, the Christian should kill, and there would be no wrong involved. If national security called for the cessation of all other activities of a spiritual nature, such as Bible study, prayer, partaking of the Lord's supper, etc., the Christian may dispense with these religious duties indefinitely without it affecting his relationship with God. In essence, whatever is required or sanctioned by the government under which one lives becomes proper to engage in so long as it is done collectively under the direction of the government.

Before proceeding any farther let it be reemphasized that we are not advocating disregard for law. We are not suggesting disrespect for the duly constituted governmental authorities. As brought out in chapter six, the Christian has definite obligations to be an obedient citizen of his nation. He is to cheerfully comply with all laws and regulations imposed upon him by his government except where to do so would involve a breach of his obligation to God according to the teaching of the Bible. When such a conflict arises the Christian must submit to the will of God first and foremost. In so doing there are times that he might be required to decline participating in an activity required, sponsored or sanctioned by the government. Such a case would be that of war.

This may best be illustrated by referring to a few specific incidents encountered by the author during his period of service in the United States Navy during World War II. While aboard ship in the Inland Sea of Japan, on mine sweeping and demolition duty there, beer was brought aboard ship and served to the crew. This was not done by an individual sailor but was provided by the Navy and was not sold but served, just as the regular meals, at no cost. Would a Christian, who held the conviction that drinking alcoholic beverages was wrong, have been justified in joining in with the other sailors in their beer-drinking just because it was under the auspices of the government? If we admit that his personal convictions could have and should have been exercised in refusing to partake of the beer, then this same principle holds true in a Christian refusing to partake in war when it stems from

"But Killing in War is Done ... Not as a Personal Act"

a sincere conviction based upon the Bible. Just because a government sanctions an action, this does not require God to sanction it. Participating in it as a member of a national unit or group does not release one from the personal responsibility for his action. Then, of course, all ex-servicemen can recall the distribution of cigarettes to the personnel of the armed forces. While these may have been donated by private organizations, they were distributed with the cooperation and sanction of the government. To accept and use tobacco does not become proper for the Christian just because it is given to him by his government.

A final incident will demonstrate that one is not justified in an action just because he engages in it collectively as part of the armed forces. Following World War II a number of Army units were transported to Japan to serve as occupation forces. In one city the author visited, the Army secured a large two-story frame building and furnished it to the troops as a house of prostitution. Japanese girls were procured and given small rooms in the building. Just outside of the building a soldier was stationed in a small booth where he sold tickets to the servicemen to be presented to the prostitutes of their choice inside the building for illicit purposes. To insure protection against the spread of disease the building was furnished, at government expense, with rooms where precautionary medical treatment could be self-administered by the military personnel who frequented the place. And even though all this went on in broad daylight, the Army added one more precaution to insure that orderliness was kept. Armed Military Police patrolled the halls inside the building.

We simply ask, could a Christian participate in the activities of such a set-up, sponsored by the military, without committing the sin of fornication? While we recognize the difference between being offered something and being commanded something, the same principle holds true. Collective action, under governmental supervision and sanction, does not remove the sin from an illicit action nor the personal responsibility of the one committing it.

But what does the Bible say about the Christian's responsibility for his actions? Regardless of whether an act is performed individually or collectively, the person

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

committing the act will be judged for it personally, not as an agent of the government. The Bible says that God's judgment "will render to every man according to his works" (Romans 2:6). Notice that each man will face God to be judged according to HIS own works, that is, the things he did as an individual. In referring to the return of Christ we are told "Then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds" (Matthew 16:27). This is again emphasized in Romans 14:12: "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." Notice that judgment will be on an individual basis. This truth is repeatedly taught in the Scriptures. Another clear passage says "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ: that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad" (II Corinthians 5:10). Other Scripture passages that bear out the same teaching are the following: Ephesians 6:8; Colossians 3:25; Revelation 20:12; 22:12.

Thus the objection that one may kill as an agent of the government and not be held accountable for his action is not upheld by the Bible. As close as the husband and wife relationship is, each one will be judged individually (Matthew 10:34-36). As close as members of the same congregation are, each one will face God for his own actions (Revelation 3:1, 4). If this is true of the members of a home and the church, it would certainly be true of citizens of a nation.

Let no one conclude that killing as a representative of the government will be excused in judgment, for God shall judge each person's life individually and not as part of any group.

CHAPTER NINE

“But Didn’t God’s People in the Old Testament Go to War?”

Of all objections used to justify Christians going to war, this one seems to betray the least understanding of the overall teaching of the Bible. The assumption lying behind the statement, “But didn’t God’s people in the Old Testament go to war?” is that whatever God has once permitted He must always allow. So, the argument goes, if we can read about the Israelites going to war and killing their enemies with God’s approval in the Old Testament, it must be acceptable for Christians to fight and kill in war today. This position completely overlooks a fundamental tenet of Biblical interpretation, recognized by all Bible students, that God has dealt with man in various ways depending upon the particular period or age. Under one period, certain laws and principles are given for directing man only to be abrogated, superceded or elevated in the next period. Let us consider how this operated throughout Bible history.

God spoke to the “fathers” or heads of families in the beginning through various means such as prophets, angels, dreams, etc. (Hebrews 1:1). This period covered the lives of such men as Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Eventually the twelve sons of Jacob were formed into a separate nation variously known as Israelites, Hebrews or Jews. In order to direct this nation God revealed His will to them, through Moses, in what was termed “the Law.” (John 1:17). Finally, God made His will known through His Son, Jesus Christ (Hebrews 1:2).

Jesus instructed his apostles during his earthly ministry and then sent the Holy Spirit to completely furnish them with all spiritual truth necessary to guide men throughout the Christian age (John 14:26; 16:13). Jesus clearly showed in his teaching that some things permitted

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

under the law of Moses were not to be permitted in the kingdom he came to establish. An example of this is marriage. Originally, God intended one man for one woman. However, under the law of Moses, divorce under certain conditions was permitted. Then, in the Christian age, there were to be no grounds for divorce except fornication (Matthew 19:3-9). The law of Moses appears to sanction more than one wife for one man (Deuteronomy 21:15) while the apostles' doctrine allows only one wife for each man (I Timothy 3:2). Numerous other examples of this principle could be cited. What was commanded or permitted under one dispensation may neither be commanded nor permitted under another. Have you ever wondered why Christians today do not observe the seventh day Sabbath, animal sacrifices, the burning of incense, circumcision, and many other religious rites and ceremonies? The simple reason is that they were required under the law of Moses which was done away with when Christ died on the cross. (See the following passages: Ephesians 2:15; Colossians 2:14; Hebrews 10:8-9). Therefore, not everything you may read about in the Old Testament portion of the Bible is to be followed by Christians today. In fact, very few principles are still applicable. Only those which are universal in nature or have been re-instituted in the New Testament apply to Christians.

Now let us consider the relationship of the Old Testament and war. It is true that God sanctioned war for His people in the Old Testament. The Israelites were a nation, with a king, territory and law which included numerous social and political statutes. In short, God's people then were a **PHYSICAL** kingdom restricted to the descendants of a particular person. It was entered by a **PHYSICAL** birth and one remained a part of it until his physical death. Its existence depended upon its maintaining an army with which to repel all physical attempts to overthrow it. Also, since God had promised that Israel would receive a specific portion of land, it followed that He would lead them in military operations designed to drive out the pagan inhabitants of that land. Everything about the Israelites of the Old Testament harmonized with the concept of armed warfare. In the wisdom of God it was considered a necessity for the times and circumstances under which they then lived. So God commissioned and directed them to war against their enemies. When we

“Didn’t God’s People in the Old Testament Go to War?”

understand the nature of the Old Testament kingdom of Israel it is not difficult to comprehend why God sanctioned war during the Old Testament period.

It is also true that God does not sanction war under the New Testament period. Part I of this study provides ample proof of this. In the New Testament period Christians are not a physical nation but rather are individuals scattered among all the nations. The church is a SPIRITUAL kingdom. It has only a heavenly king, the Lord Jesus Christ, who said that the worship of God would not be restricted to a specific, geographical location under his reign (John 4:19-21). Under the New Testament, men would worship God in spirit and truth (John 4:23-24). They would enter Christ’s kingdom by a spiritual birth (John 3:3-5). For additional information on the spiritual nature of the church see Part I, Chapter 9. There is nothing about the church that calls for the need of armed combat. Neither is the Christian under any obligation to fight on behalf of any earthly government, regardless of how just its cause may be. See Part II, Chapters 6 and 8 for further discussion on this point.

Let us approach this objection from one other viewpoint. Since God’s people did take human life in the Old Testament period with His sanction, let us look at this matter more carefully. The objection we are considering holds that, if it were right for God’s people to kill at His direction in the Old Testament, it must be acceptable under the New Testament. If that objection is sound it would stand the test of consistency. Let us see if it does.

In the Old Testament period, under the law of Moses, there were numerous laws which required God’s people to “put to death” their fellow human beings because of particular sins they committed. If what was done in the Old Testament is to be the standard for governing a Christian’s conduct today then it would be proper for Christians to put people to death for the same reasons as given in the Old Testament. Let us look at some of the regulations calling for the death sentence in the Old Testament where God’s people were to inflict the death penalty.

In religious matters the Israelites were to put people to death for the following offences: Blaspheming the name of God (Leviticus 24:10-16, 23); Worshipping other gods besides Jehovah (Deuteronomy 17:2-7); Enticing others to participate in a false religion (Deuteronomy 13:

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

5-10); Practicing sorcery or witchcraft (Leviticus 20:27; Exodus 22:18); Violating the restrictions of Sabbath day observance (Numbers 15:32-36; Exodus 31:14-15; 35:2). By using the same argument "But didn't God's people in the Old Testament go to war?" we could justify killing people who cursed God, worshipped according to a false religion or recommended it to others, conducted seances where they sought to consult with the dead, or failed to partake of the Lord's supper on the first day of the week. Remember, the issue involved in this objection has nothing to do with what the government requires but only with what God sanctioned in the Old Testament. If He permitted His people to inflict the death penalty for the above mentioned offences in the Old Testament, this objection would make it right for Christians to do the same today.

A second realm in which the Israelites were required by specific command to punish by death had to do with the parent-child relationship. Under the Old Testament law the following acts were punishable by death: Rebellion or disobedience of a child toward his parents (Deuteronomy 21:18-21); Cursing of a parent (Exodus 21:17; Leviticus 20:9); Smiting or hitting a parent (Exodus 21:15). Consistency would require Christians to stone their children today who were guilty of the above actions. Obviously whatever occasions called for inflicting death by God's people, under His direction, in the Old Testament do not call for such treatment by Christians under the New Testament.

A third realm in which death, usually by stoning, was carried out upon offenders of the law by the Israelites had to do with sex crimes. They were: Homosexuality, (Leviticus 20:13); Adultery (Leviticus 20:10; Deuteronomy 22:22); Incest (sexual relations between close relatives) (Leviticus 20:11-12); Rape (Deuteronomy 22:25); Marrying a mother and her daughter (Leviticus 20:14); Fornication (Deuteronomy 22:23-24); Unchastity (A woman found not to be a virgin at marriage) (Deuteronomy 22:20-21); Bestiality (man or woman) (Exodus 22:19; Leviticus 20:15-16). Certainly these crimes are despicable but who would say that Christians should kill those who commit them today just because the Israelites were required to in the Old Testament?

A number of other crimes were punished by death

inflicted by God's people. Among them were: Man stealing (Exodus 21:16; Deuteronomy 24:7); Not penning up an animal known to have gored a human to death (Exodus 21:29); A stranger coming near the Tabernacle (Numbers 1:51). These examples are sufficient to prove beyond doubt that just because God's people put human beings to death in the Old Testament, there is no reason to conclude that Christians are free to do so today with God's approval. Thus, the Old Testament argument for justifying war is invalid.

Perhaps, here would be a good place to make mention of the subject of capital punishment. While a lengthy treatment is not considered within the scope of this study, the author's position is that capital punishment for murder is authorized by the Scriptures and should be practiced by governmental authorities today. Briefly, it was a principle given before the law of Moses came into being and therefore would not have necessarily passed away with the law (see Genesis 9:6). It was carried over into the law (Exodus 21:12; Leviticus 24:17, 21; Numbers 35:16-21, 30-33). But most important, the New Testament Scriptures authorize the civil government to "bear the sword" against evildoers. This would certainly indicate the right to execute, with the death penalty, those who take human life (read Romans 13:1-7 and I Peter 2:13-14 carefully). Also, Paul's willingness to die at the hands of the Roman government if found guilty of a capital offense provides the endorsement by an inspired apostle of the right of government to inflict capital punishment (Acts 25:10-11).

It might be good to point out that these passages cannot be made to justify a government bearing the sword in war. First of all, they teach that a government's authority is over its own subjects, not those of another nation. Secondly, the sword is to be borne against evildoers only, whereas war brings death to completely innocent individuals. Finally, if these passages teach that a government could kill the citizens of other nations, they also teach that a government can require obedience to all its laws from other nations. The example of paying taxes is specifically given. Can one government levy taxes on the citizens of another government outside its jurisdiction? Of course not! Neither can it rightfully use the sword in taking vengeance upon those citizens.

CHAPTER TEN

“What Would You Do if your Wife, Mother or Daughter Were Attacked or Molested?”

Here is the classic objection! Its appeal is saturated with man's deepest emotion...love. Its strength lies in the universal nature of a man to want to protect those he loves, especially when the sacred honor of the weaker vessel is at stake. This becomes the “unanswerable” objection intended to put an end to the controversy. “What would you do if someone broke into your home and began to rape your wife?” If it is admitted that any physical action at all would be justified, the objector's quick reply comes, “then why should you refuse to go to war? It's all the same.”

But, for argument's sake, let us suppose you answered, “I would shoot him down in cold blood.” This would still not justify war. For, at least the guilty person would be dealt with in the case of an attempted rape. But how would an attacker's action ever justify your going half way around the world and killing his brother, his neighbors and as many of his countrymen as possible? This is what war calls for.

But the objection is basically unfair. It is hypothetical and therefore a person's response to such a situation is incapable of being determined by any similar past experience. After all, who really knows what he would do under such extreme circumstances...for certain? A person could say what he thinks he would do, or what he should do, but no one could say with absolute certainty exactly what he would do at a time like that. If a person took the position that he should not kill, even to prevent the rape of his wife, he might well turn on the attacker in a fit of blind rage and beat him to death mercilessly. This would not prove that his opposition to killing was wrong

but only that his action in failing to abide by his conviction was wrong. Not even your objector would admit that he always acts in perfect harmony with his standards. And he could never tell you, with certainty, what he would do under a set of extreme conditions which he had never experienced before. This objection attempts to obtain a commitment from a person where, by the very nature of the case, one cannot possibly be given. While this objection seems most unfair, yet it is perhaps the most common one used in efforts to refute the position of the Christian who opposes killing in war on the basis of Bible teaching. Notwithstanding, this is a favorite objection of selective service boards in their interviews with those who claim exemption from military service because of their religious beliefs. So the Christian must face up to such an objection, think it through, and be prepared to give an answer consistent with Bible teaching.

In discussing this objection we must first examine the meaning of FORCE and then determine if and when it may be properly used by a Christian. The dictionary gives several definitions for the word "force." In this study let us state that force is simply the EXERTION OF POWER IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH A GIVEN END. Force can be either ACTIVE or PASSIVE. If a state refuses to issue a license to operate a restaurant, this is a means of passive force designed to prevent a person from selling prepared meals to the public. It may be due to a failure to comply with sanitary regulations. But the state may force one of its citizens to refrain from conducting such a business. This is passive force. Traffic signs are another example of passive force. "One Way" on a sign post acts as a mute and yet restraining force to prevent one from entering a certain street.

Within Scriptural and legal limits a Christian may exert passive force. In the face of danger there are several ways in which a Christian may legitimately make use of passive force. In order to prevent someone from entering your home you may lock your doors. In so doing you are forcing those on the outside to stay out. Of course, all such passive force may be actively violated. A person can open a restaurant in spite of having no license and thereby becomes subject to arrest. A person may drive the wrong way down a one-way street and be fined. A person may batter in your door to gain entrance. While passive

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

force can be countered by active violence, this does not mean that passive force is of no value. The disciples of Christ feared the Jews following the Lord's resurrection and so met together behind "shut" (probably barred) doors (John 20:19, 26). Following the imprisonment of Peter, the church which met in Mary's house in Jerusalem for prayer did so behind a gate through which Peter could not enter until it was opened for him (Acts 12:13-16). Christians may force people to stay out of their homes by locking their doors.

Another reaction which Christians may have in the face of danger is flight. If someone is attempting to break into your home to molest you, you may exercise the passive force of fleeing to avoid being hurt. If such persons are intent upon harming you and you leave your home by another door, you are forcing them not to realize the fulfillment of their desires. Jesus warned the Christians in Jerusalem to "flee unto the mountains" when they saw the Roman armies advancing toward the city (Matthew 24:15-18). The Jews in Damascus sought to kill the apostle Paul. To avoid this Paul was lowered over the city wall and thereby escaped their plot against his life (Acts 9:23-25). This is a legitimate use of passive force.

A third use of passive force is to appeal to law enforcement authorities to deal with intruders. As we saw in chapter six, God has ordained that "the powers that be" are to deal with "him that doeth evil" (Romans 13:1-4). When molested or threatened in any way the Christian has the privilege of appealing to the civil authorities for assistance. The apostle Paul appealed to Caesar when his accusers attempted to incriminate him with false charges (Acts 25:10-11). The Christian cannot take the law into his own hands and render vengeance upon an evildoer, but must summon those whose responsibility it is to handle such matters. Although the authorities are permitted to "bear the sword" in the execution of their duty, the Christian still only exerts passive force in calling the police when danger threatens.

We now come to another type of force which we may term **ACTIVE FORCE**. Active force may be of two kinds, namely, **RESTRAINING** and **DESTRUCTIVE**. Destructive force is the intentional and premeditated taking of life in order to achieve some given end. Murder is an example of destructive force. War is another. In both

cases the express purpose of the action is to destroy a human life. Regardless of the eventual end in mind, if the means to it involves the outright killing of a person, such a wanton act is a type of force forbidden to the Christian (see Part I, chapters two through five).

The second type of active force we may term **RESTRAINING** force. Restraining force is not motivated by any purpose or intention of destroying a life. Furthermore, it does not even seek to inflict bodily injury or harm of any kind. Its sole purpose is the desire to restrain or prevent injury or death. It is prompted by love and executed for the benefit of all involved, without requiring the destruction of any. Such a restraining force, however, does not exclude entirely the use of violent action of some kind. The issue is not violence versus non-violence, but destruction versus preservation.

Consider the following illustrations of the use of active, restraining force which violates no Christian principle and therefore may be exerted by a Christian. Parental discipline which involves spanking or paddling a child is an active force designed to restrain a child from continuing on in disobedience or some other undesirable conduct. This is clearly authorized by the teaching of the Bible (Proverbs 13:24; 22:15; 29:15; Ephesians 6:4; and Hebrews 12:9-11). Here is a case of exercising active force with a view to restraining the child from future harm to himself and his character or to society in general. Injury or death are the farthest things from the mind of the parent who administers such discipline out of love for the child and for those with whom this child will someday be associated in the home and community. God's approval unmistakably rests upon this form of active, restraining force.

Take the case of a child who is found about to swallow something poisonous or who is playing with a loaded revolver. Active, restraining force would need to be exerted suddenly and even violently in order to prevent the child from harming himself, or in the case of the gun, from harming or killing another. The motive of such a restraining force is to preserve life and not to destroy it. The goal in view is to see all concerned spared from injury or death. Thus, this type of force would certainly be justified.

Suppose you worked as an attendant in a mental in-

stitution and one of the patients went berserk and began attacking the nurses and doctors. Suppose he then rushed to an open window and was about to jump out to his death five floors below. A Christian would be justified in exercising the active, restraining force required to subdue this deranged person. If it required tackling him or holding his arms until help could arrive to administer necessary treatment, the Christian would do this to prevent injury or loss of life to the mental patient and those whom he may harm. The motive must always be to preserve BOTH the violent person AND those he may injure. To take the one's life to spare the others would be a destructive force unacceptable to the Christian.

We may term this active, restraining force **BENEVOLENT RESTRAINT**. It is a restraining force which seeks always to benefit and never resorts to an action which would destroy or injure as primary goal. This **BENEVOLENT RESTRAINT** has as its primary purpose always to prevent death from occurring so therefore could never involve any action which would cause it. To shoot to death an armed gunman in order to prevent him from shooting others could not be termed **BENEVOLENT RESTRAINT**. To attempt to disarm him, without resorting to a destructive weapon, would be a form of restraint with a benevolent purpose. If it be objected that this would be less effective, we reply that it would be more in keeping with Bible principles for a Christian's conduct. It is also admitted that an attempt to disarm or overpower a vicious attacker without resorting to a weapon of destructive force is far more dangerous. But again, the Christian's chief concern must be for the welfare of others rather than for himself. Certainly to follow this course of action would not be easy. Some might even suggest that it would be unnatural. We reply that many things required of a Christian are contrary to the natural response of the unregenerated person. While one may rationalize that the use of **BENEVOLENT RESTRAINT** would be impractical, ineffective, or even foolhardy, this does not alter what the Bible teaches on the matter.

Now, let us return to our objector's question, "What would you do if...?" If intruders are known to be coming, a Christian may call the police, lock his doors and either remain there in prayer or else leave the house for safer quarters. Should he be caught in his home and the in-

truder enters and makes an attempt to molest his wife, mother or daughter, the Christian may use physical force to restrain the attacker from committing any harm or abuse to his loved ones. In the process of attempting to prevent the evil action the Christian must avoid whatever measures that would require the taking of life. Needless to say, this would not be an easy situation in which to exercise calm wisdom and thoughtful restraint. A person's emotions would be strained to the breaking point, no doubt. His ability to maintain composure and self-control would be tested to their fullest. Under the mental and emotional pressures of the situation it would be extremely difficult for most Christians, perhaps, to allow their inner convictions to regulate their outward physical actions. As mentioned before, in such a hypothetical circumstance, it is impossible to describe exactly how one would react. We are here setting forth what we believe to be the proper conduct for a Christian faced with an attack on his wife. Whether or not any Christian ever used benevolent restraint, as described above, does not affect the rightness of this position. Whatever the Bible teaches is right, regardless of whether or not anyone follows its teaching. But since God does not require the impossible, we believe that a consecrated Christian can react with benevolent restraint under such circumstances.

Therefore if a Christian is not at liberty to kill in repelling an attack upon his family, surely he would not be permitted to do so as a soldier in war. If this provides an answer to the "unanswerable" question, then the last and most difficult objection against non-participation in war has been removed.

Epilogue

This study has been a sincere effort to present New Testament teaching for governing a Christian's attitude toward armed warfare. The purpose of this material has been to provide a sound, Scriptural basis for developing convictions which would lead a devout, Bible Christian to decide against participating in war in any form. Let it be added quickly, however, that this material is intended solely for individual study and action, and in no sense is to be regarded as the "official position" of any group. Let each reader study the material honestly and prayerfully and arrive at personal conclusions about the matter under discussion. Let whatever action that may be taken be motivated by the Word of God. If this book aids the earnest Christian in determining God's will for his life as it relates to war, the author will be abundantly gratified.

Due to present conditions in America, the author wishes to make clear his position once more, lest this material be used to bolster some action not intended by its presentation. The author disclaims any connection with or responsibility for certain activities currently associated with non-participation in war. The position taken in this work should not be construed as condoning refusal to register for the draft or any other failure to cooperate with the Selective Service System. The practice of draft card burning, flag burning and all other forms of contempt for the United States and its laws are deplored as absolutely contrary to the Christian spirit of willing submission to legally constituted authority.

Other practices by self-styled "pacifists," which have no Biblical justification, are refusal to cooperate with Civil Defense instructions, air raid drills or any other precaution designed to insure the safety of the community in the event of an attack. It is regrettable that a number of

political and ethical "objectors" to war have gained national publicity by such unreasonable actions. This has placed the Christian position against participating in war in an unfavorable light. Most of this type of "objector" has little or no interest in true Bible Christianity and many of them do not even accept the Scriptures as wholly inspired.

Furthermore, the current wave of "demonstrations," "marches," and "campaigns" attempting to mold and sway public opinion fails to deal with the root of war. This whole approach, often spearheaded by idealistic religious liberals, Socialists and even Communists who deny the very basic fundamentals of Bible Christianity, is an empty one compared with the Christian position on war. It may appear that they are part of the same "movement," but God's people deal with men's hearts, like a doctor dealing with the causes of a disease. War is a symptom.

It is futile for a Christian to campaign or participate in a movement designed to make the non-Christian world legislate war out of existence. Non-participation in war will always be an individual matter and must result only from one's personal commitment to serve Almighty God and obey Him. A humble Christian will not participate in "sit-ins," "teach-ins," "love-ins," (perhaps better termed "rebel-ins") or other mass efforts to demonstrate disapproval of war. Bible Christians deplore war, and so do many honest people in the "hippie" type groups. But the fact that many of the latter use such slogans as "make love not war" cannot offset their filth, dope-addiction, sex orgies and other obnoxious anti-Christian activities. Such people may have a noble end in sight, but ignore God's means of achieving that end.

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

Such practices as lying down on railroad tracks in "protest" of troop train movements, or public suicide by self-immolation as expressions of opposition to national war policies are thoroughly repugnant to the nature of New Testament Christianity, notwithstanding the fact that they are engaged in or approved of by prominent "clergymen."

The Christian is a law-abiding, responsible citizen of his community and nation. He is a patriotic person who loves his God first and deeply appreciates his country for providing him with the freedom to worship Him unmolested. The Christian willingly accepts all responsibilities imposed upon him by his government and faithfully discharges his obligations in every realm where he can do so without violating his higher obligation to God.

It is the author's wish that God's blessing attends the prayerful study of this material. It is hoped that whatever truth it contains will be earnestly obeyed and that any error found will be forgiven and forsaken.

NOTE FROM THE EPILOGUE

70. Guy F. Hershberger, *WAR, PEACE, AND NONRESISTANCE*, (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press: 1953) p. 198.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS:

- Bainton, Roland H., **CHRISTIAN ATTITUDES TOWARD WAR AND PEACE**, (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press: 1960)
- Bales, James D. and Stonestreet, P. W., **THE CHRISTIAN AND CARNAL WARFARE-DEBATE** (Searcy, Ark.: James D. Bales: 1947)
- Boles, H. Leo, **THE NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING ON WAR**, (Nashville, Tenn.: The Gospel Advocate Co.: no date)
- Fudge, Bennie Lee, **CAN A CHRISTIAN KILL FOR HIS GOVERNMENT?** (Athens, Ala.: The C. E. I. Store: 1943)
- Hershberger, Guy Franklin, **WAR, PEACE AND NONRESISTANCE**, (Scottsdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press: 1953)
- Macgregor, G. H. C., **THE NEW TESTAMENT BASIS OF PACIFISM**, (Nyack, N. Y.: Fellowship Publications: 1960)
- Rutenber, Culbert G., **THE DAGGER AND THE CROSS**, (Nyack, N. Y.: Fellowship Publications: 1958)
- Toews, J. A., **TRUE NONRESISTANCE THROUGH CHRIST**, (Winnipeg, Canad: The Christian Press Ltd.: 1955)

TRACTS AND ARTICLES:

- Bales, James D., "The Use of the New Testament to Justify War for the Christian," **GOSPEL DIGEST**, Vol. 15, No. 10, March, 1958 (Athens, Ala.)
- Blakely, Fred O., "When the Church was Pure," **THE APOSTLES DOCTRINE**, Vol. 2 (Revised) p. 281, (Highland, Ind.: Fred O. Blakely: 1959)
- Campbell, Alexander, "Address on War," **POPULAR LECTURES AND ADDRESSES**, p. 342, (Hollywood, Calif.: Old Paths Book Club: no date)
- Also in tract form (Nashville, Tenn.: World Vision Publishing Co.)
- Dailey, J. Charles, "Capital Punishment and War," **THE PATTERN**, Vol. 5, No. 15, Aug. 1, 1962, (Vancouver, Washington)
- _____, "The Sword of the Spirit or the Sword of Caesar?" **THE PATTERN**, Vol. 8, No. 11, Nov. 1, 1965, (Vancouver, Washington)
- Dennis, Fred E., **WAR!**, (Athens, Alabama: The C. E. I. Store: no date)
- Goushaw, A/2c Larry J., "Can A Christian Kill?" **THE CHURCH SPEAKS**, Vol. 13, No. 4, July 1961, (Portland, Oregon)
- Holifield, Honorable Chet, "Declaration and Appeal on Carnal Warfare-Extension of Remarks of Hon. Chet Holifield of California in the House of Representatives, Saturday, July 5, 1952" **CONGRESSIONAL RECORD-APPENDIX**, Vol. 98, Monday, Aug. 18, 1952, No. 127.
- Hostetter, C. N. Jr., **WAR AND THE WORD**, (Nappanee, Ind.: E. V. Publishing House: no date)
- Hunt, Donald G., **GOD, UNCLE SAM AND YOU**, (Ottumwa, Iowa: The Voice of Evangelism: no date)
- Jonas, Larry, "Nationalistic Militarism," **THE PATTERN**, Vol. 7, No. 11, Nov. 1, 1964, (Vancouver, Washington)
- Lard, Moses E., "Should Christians Go To War?" **LARD'S QUARTERLY**, Vol. 3, 1866, page 225, (Lexington, Kentucky)

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

- Nichols, Gus, "Christians and Carnal Warfare," GOSPEL DIGEST, Vol. 2, No. 5, Oct. 1953, (Athens, Alabama)
- Reyman, Rodney, "God's Plan for World Peace," THE VOICE OF EVANGELISM, Vol. 11, No. 32, Aug. 11, 1956, (Ottumwa, Iowa)
- Sawyer, Wyatt, "Can a Christian Fight for His Government?" TEENAGE CHRISTIAN, Vol. 3, No. 2, Feb. 1962, (Austin, Tex.)
- Toews, Monroe, WHY I CAN'T TAKE PART IN CARNAL WARFARE SINCE I'VE BECOME A CHRISTIAN, (Hesston, Kan.: Free Tract and Bible Society: 1962)
- Ulery, Bishop O. B., CAN A CHRISTIAN FIGHT? (Nappanee, Ind.: E. V. Publishing House, Fifth Edition, no date)
- Word, Archie, "Can a Christian Go to War?" THE CHURCH SPEAKS, Vol. 8, No. 2, July 12, 1953, (Portland, Oregon)
- _____, "War ... the Madness Deemed Wisdom and Necessary," THE VOICE OF EVANGELISM, Vol. 17, No. 5, Feb. 3, 1962 (Ottumwa, Iowa)
- _____, "When War Comes" THE VOICE OF EVANGELISM, Vol. 4, No. 34, Aug. 20, 1949, (Ottumwa, Iowa)

INDEX TO SCRIPTURES CITED IN THIS BOOK

(PAGE NUMBERS IN PARENTHESES)

Genesis 9:6 (95)	Matthew 7:15-20 (35)
Exodus 21:12 (95)	Matthew 9:9-13 (75)
Exodus 21:15 (94)	Matthew 9:38 (72)
Exodus 21:16 (95)	Matthew 10:34-39 (64, 65, 82, 90)
Exodus 21:17 (94)	Matthew 16:16-19 (29)
Exodus 21:29 (95)	Matthew 16:27 (90)
Exodus 22:18 (94)	Matthew 19:3-9 (92)
Exodus 22:19 (94)	Matthew 21:31-32 (75)
Exodus 31:14-15 (94)	Matthew 22:14 (62)
Exodus 35:2 (94)	Matthew 22:17 (85)
Leviticus 20:9 (94)	Matthew 22:21 (85)
Leviticus 20:10 (94)	Matthew 22:36-40 (15)
Leviticus 20:11-12 (94)	Matthew 24:2 (42)
Leviticus 20:13 (94)	Matthew 24:15-18 (98)
Leviticus 20:14 (94)	Matthew 26:52 (33, 51)
Leviticus 20:15-16 (94)	Matthew 28:18-20 (23, 29)
Leviticus 20:27 (94)	Mark 1:12 (72)
Leviticus 24:10-16, 23 (93)	Mark 12:30-31 (15)
Leviticus 24:17, 21 (95)	Mark 13:1-37 (41)
Numbers 1:51 (95)	Mark 13:14 (42)
Numbers 15:32-36 (94)	Mark 16:15-16 (23, 29)
Numbers 35:16-21, 30-33 (95)	Luke 4:28-30 (72)
Deuteronomy 13:5-10 (93)	Luke 6:22 (69)
Deuteronomy 17:2-7 (93)	Luke 6:26 (69)
Deuteronomy 21:15 (92)	Luke 6:27 (8)
Deuteronomy 21:18-21 (94)	Luke 6:35 (8, 12)
Deuteronomy 22:20-21 (94)	Luke 10:29 (15)
Deuteronomy 22:22 (94)	Luke 19:1-9 (75)
Deuteronomy 22:23-24 (94)	Luke 19:7 (75)
Deuteronomy 22:25 (94)	Luke 19:8 (75)
Deuteronomy 23:3-6 (15)	Luke 19:41-44 (9)
Deuteronomy 24:7 (95)	Luke 21:5-38 (41)
Deuteronomy 25:19 (16)	Luke 21:20 (42, 43)
II Chronicles 7:14 (63)	Luke 21:21 (43)
Proverbs 13:24 (99)	Luke 24:46-49 (23, 30)
Proverbs 22:15 (99)	John 1:17 (91)
Proverbs 29:15 (99)	John 2:13-17 (70, 71)
Isaiah 9:6-7 (31)	John 3:3-5 (93)
Isaiah 11:1-10 (30)	John 4:19-21 (93)
Daniel 3 (82)	John 4:23-24 (93)
Daniel 6 (82)	John 12:48 (7)
Joel 2:28ff (29)	John 13:34-35 (18)
Micah 4:1-4 (29, 30, 50)	John 14:26 (91)
Zachariah 8:17 (12)	John 15:12 (18)
Matthew 5:9 (31)	John 16:13 (91)
Matthew 5:38-39 (13)	John 18:6 (72)
Matthew 5:43 (15)	John 18:36 (33)
Matthew 5:44 (8)	John 20:19, 26 (98)
Matthew 6:7-8 (26)	Acts 1:4 (30)
Matthew 6:33 (82)	Acts 1:12 (30)
Matthew 7:12 (21)	Acts 2:5 (29)
Matthew 7:14 (62)	Acts 2:17ff (29)

A CHRISTIAN VIEW OF ARMED WARFARE

Acts 2:38 (35)	Ephesians 6:12 (32)
Acts 2:42 (26)	Ephesians 6:18 (26)
Acts 5:29 (81)	Philippians 1:4 (26)
Acts 8:1-4 (23)	Philippians 2:5 (6)
Acts 9:23-25 (98)	Philippians 4:6 (26)
Acts 12:13-16 (98)	Colossians 1:13 (29)
Acts 16:23-24 (74)	Colossians 2:14 (92)
Acts 25:10-11 (95, 98)	Colossians 3:25 (90)
Romans 2:6 (90)	I Thessalonians 4:9-10 (18)
Romans 5:5 (36)	I Thessalonians 5:15 (12, 13)
Romans 5:6-10 (66)	I Thessalonians 5:17 (26)
Romans 5:8 (12)	I Thessalonians 5:22 (36)
Romans 6:1-2 (22)	I Timothy 3:2 (92)
Romans 10:13-14 (24)	I Timothy 3:7 (68)
Romans 10:14-15 (24)	I Timothy 3:15 (29)
Romans 12:10 (18)	II Timothy 3:13 (14)
Romans 12:17-18 (13)	Titus 3:1 (78)
Romans 12:19 (14)	Hebrews 1:1 (91)
Romans 12:20 (9)	Hebrews 1:2 (91)
Romans 12:21 (13)	Hebrews 1:9 (12)
Romans 13:1-7	Hebrews 10:8-9 (92)
(14, 78, 79, 86, 95, 98)	Hebrews 12:9-11 (99)
Romans 13:8 (17)	Hebrews 12:23 (14)
Romans 14:10 (6)	Hebrews 13:1 (18)
Romans 14:12 (90)	James 1:27 (84)
Romans 15:12 (31)	James 2:8 (17)
I Corinthians 2:14 (6)	James 4:1-2 (63)
I Corinthians 4:12 (13)	James 4:3 (26)
I Corinthians 10:32-33 (68)	James 4:4-5 (6)
II Corinthians 5:10 (6, 90)	James 4:7 (81)
II Corinthians 6:14 (39)	I Peter 1:22 (18)
II Corinthians 10:3-4 (31)	I Peter 2:13-17 (78, 79)
II Corinthians 10:5 (32)	I Peter 2:13-14 (78, 81, 95)
Galatians 2:20 (6)	I Peter 3:9 (13)
Galatians 5:14-15 (17)	I Peter 4:17 (29)
Galatians 5:18 (6)	II Peter 1:4 (6)
Galatians 6:10 (84)	I John 3:14 (18)
Galatians 6:14 (6)	I John 3:15 (19)
Ephesians 2:4-5 (12)	I John 3:16 (66)
Ephesians 2:15 (92)	I John 3:22 (26)
Ephesians 5:22 (35, 36)	I John 3:23 (18)
Ephesians 5:29 (21)	I John 4:9-11 (18)
Ephesians 6:1 (81)	I John 5:14-15 (26)
Ephesians 6:4 (99)	Revelation 3:1 (90)
Ephesians 6:8 (90)	Revelation 3:4 (90)
Ephesians 6:10-18 (18, 32)	Revelation 20:12 (90)
	Revelation 22:12 (90)